DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 644 EC 151 631

AUTHOR Smith, Theresa Catherine
TITLE Public Law 94-142 and the Private Special Education School.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 199p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Federal Legislation; *Private Schools; *Special Schools; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Education for All Handicapped Children Act; Rehabilitation Act 1973 (Section 504)

ABSTRACT

A survey of 77 schools was conducted to investigate the effect of P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) on private special education schools in 12 western states. Chapter I looks at the purpose, population, procedure, and data treatment of the study as well as defining several terms. The second chapter reviews literature pertaining to the evolution of American private and special education, the development of the private special education schools, and legislation affecting the handicapped. Chapter III makes up the bulk of the document and contains tables with statistical data, and chapter IV presents a review and discussion of the findings. Data are grouped into two broad groupings-- 1) data relative to structuring of reporting schools (such as administration, budgetary considerations, and numbers of students), and 2) Public Law 94-142 (with categories relating to impact on enrollment, financial status, school control, school staff, and future school operations). Chapter V presents results of the three personal interviews concerning the law's impact on specific special education schools. A final chapter summarizes the findings and looks at the weaknesses and heuristic qualities of the study. Appendixes include a review of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973--Section 504, a copy of the survey form, and the interview format. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227644

ABSTRACT

PUBLIC LAW 94-142 AND THE PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL

By

Theresa Catherine Smith

B.S., University of Nevada, Las Vegas

M.Ed., University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 1973

Mark G. Beals, Ph.D., Research Advisor
Professor of Special Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

April 1982

EC151631

©Copyright by Theresa Catherine Smith, 1982
All Rights Reserved

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Theresa Catherine Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PUBLIC LAW 94-142 AND THE
PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL

ABSTRACT

PUBLIC LAW 94-142 AND THE PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to gain insights into what effect, if any, enactment of Public Law 94-142--the Education of All Handicapped Children Act--had upon private special education schools in twelve western states.

A total of seventy-seven schools responded to a comprehensive eight-question, multi-itemed survey. Results were programmed through the Computer Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, then translated to tabular form.

Findings were presented and discussed under two broad headings: Data relative to structuring of reporting schools; and Public Law 94-142.

A composite, or average, school was identified and a composite impact of the Law upon that school was presented.

Certain weaknesses of the study were noted and its heuristic qualities were discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Chapter

I. THE STUDY
Introduction 1
Purpose of the Study 2
Population 3
Procedure. 4
Statistical Treatment of Data. 4
Definition of Terms. 4
Summary. 6

II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Evolution of the American Private School 7
Evolution of the American Special Education Movement 8
Evolution of the American Private Special Education School 9
Pre-P.L. 94-142 Legislation for the Handicapped. . . . 10
Public Law 94-142 and Its Relevancy to the Private School 13
Summary. 18

III. PRESENTATION OF DATA

Table

1. General School Setting 20
2. Affiliations and Accreditations. 21
3. Governance 22
4. Fulltime Administration. 23
5. Parttime Administration. 24
6. Fulltime Support Personnel 25
7. Parttime Support Personnel 26
8. Faculty-Staff. 27
9. Certified Teacher:Pupil Ratio. 35
10. Total Adult:Pupil Ratio. 36
11. Funding Sources. 37
12. Frequency of Funding Sources Available to Each School. 38
13. Proportion of Various Sources of Tuition Fees 39
14. Fiscal Budget Balanced 43
15. Sources to Resolve Fiscal Deficit. 44
16. Tuition Rate 45

17. Scholarship per School Year. 46
18. Average Value of Each Scholarship. 47
19. Curricula. 48
20. Supportive Services. 49
21. Number of Supportive Services Available to Each of the Seventy-Seven Reporting Schools. 50
22. Referral Sources 51
23. Types of Handicapping Conditions Accepted. . . 52
24. Number of Handicapping Conditions Accepted by Each Reporting School. 53
25. Total Number of Students Enrolled in Graded and Non-Graded Schools 54
26. Number of Students by Grade Level Reported by Thirty-Eight Schools 55
27. Impact of Public Law 94-142 upon School Enrollment 56
28. Direction of Impact of Public Law 94-142 upon School Enrollment. 57
29. Degree of Increase of Enrollment as Result of Public Law 94-142. 58
30. As a Result of Public Law 94-142, the Proportion of Student Population Increased Identified as Male 59
31. Proportion of Various Handicapping Conditions Reflected in Increased Enrollments as a Result of Public Law 94-142. 60
32. Impact of Public Law 94-142 upon Financial Status of Reporting Schools. 61
33. Resolution of Financial Problems Experienced by Reporting Schools as a Result of Public Law 94-142 62
34. Means for Having Resolved Financial Problems Encountered by Twenty-Seven Reporting Schools as a Result of Public Law 94-142 . . 63
35. Proposed Means for Resolving Financial Problems Encountered by Reporting Schools as a Result of Public Law 94-142 64
36. Effect of Public Law 94-142 upon Freedom of Reporting Schools to Maintain Singular Control Over Their Policies, Procedures, Curricular Content, and Implementation . . . 65
37. Attitudes of Reporting Schools Relative to Receiving Continuing Direct Financial Support from the Federal Government. 66
38. Faculty Understanding of Public Law 94-142 Relative to its Mandates 67
39. Faculty Acceptance of Public Law 94-142 Relative to its Mandates 68
40. Administrative Understanding of Public Law 94-142 Relative to its Mandates. 40
41. Administrative Acceptance of Public Law 94-142

Relative to its Mandates 70
42. Impact of Public Law 94-142 upon the Current and Projected Operations of Reporting Schools. 71
Summary. 78

IV. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

Introduction 79
Data Relative to Structuring of Reporting Schools. 79
Settings. 79
Results. 79
Discussion 80
Accreditations. 81
Results. 81
Discussion 81
Administration. 82
Governance 82
Results 82
Discussion. 82
Staffing, Fulltime 83
Results 83
Executive Director 83
Director 83
Assistant Director 83
Principal. 84
Headmaster 84
Business Manager/Accountant. 84
Admissions Director. 84
Discussion. 85
Staffing, Parttime 86
Results 68
Executive Director 86
Director 86
Assistant Director/Principal/ Headmaster 86
Business Manager/Accountant. 86
Admissions Officer/Other 86
Discussion. 87
Personnel 87
Support Staff, Fulltime. 88
Results 88
Psychologists. 86
Psychiatrists. 88
Physicians/Nurses. 88
Other. 88
Support Staff, Parttime. 89
Results 89
Psychologists. 89
Psychiatrists. 89

Physicians/Nurses. 89
Other. 90
Discussion. 90
Instructional Staff, Numbers 92
Results 92
Discussion. 92
Instructional Staff, Certificated. 93
Results 93
General. 93
Special Education. 93
Elementary Education 94
Secondary Education. 94
Other Areas. 94
Instructional Staff, Non-Certificated. 95
Results 95
Interns. 95
Paraprofessionals. 95
Discussion. 95
Certified Adult:Student Ratio. 96
Results 96
Total Adult:Student Ratio. 97
Results 97
Discussion. 97
Budgetary Considerations. 98
Funding Sources. 98
Results 98
Numbers of Funding Sources Available 98
Results 99
Funding Sources for Tuition: P.L. 94-142. . . . 99
Results 99
Funding Sources for Tuition: Scholarships . . . 100
Results 100
Funding Sources for Tuition: Parents. 100
Results 100
Funding Sources for Tuition: Other. 100
Results 100
Status of Budget 101
Results 101
Tuition Schedules. 102
Results 102
Ten-Month Schools. 102
Twelve-Month Schools 102
Scholarship Awards 102
Results 102
Valuation of Scholarships Awarded. 103
Results 103
Discussion. 103
Curricular Considerations 108
Content. 108
Results 108
Supportive Services. 109

Results 109
Discussion. 109
Sources and Types of Students Served. 111
Sources. 111
Results 111
Types. 112
Results 112
Learning Disabilities. 112
Emotionally Disturbed. 112
Mentally Handicapped 112
Other. 112
Number of Students Enrolled 113
Total Number of Students Enrolled in Graded and Non-Graded Schools 113
Results 113
Discussion. 113
Number of Students by Grade Level Reported by Thirty-Eight Schools. 114
Results 114
Discussion. 115
Numbers of Different Handicapping Conditions Served. 116
Results. 116
Discussion 116
The Composite School. 119
Setting. 119
Governance 119
Support Personnel. 120
Faculty. 120
Funding. 120
Curriculum 121
Students 121
Enrollments. 121
Public Law 94-142. 122
Impact upon Enrollment. 122
Increase or Decrease 122
Results 122
Sex Ratio. 122
Results 122
Discussion. 123
Specific Handicapping Conditions 123
Results 124
Learning Disabilities. 124
Emotionally Distrubed. 124
Mentally Handicapped 124
Other Categories 125
Discussion. 126
Impact upon Financial Status. 126
Negative Impact. 126
Results 126
Resolution 127

Discussion. 128
Impact upon School Control. 128
Policies, Procedures, Curricular Content and Implementation 128
Results 128
Discussion. 128
Impact upon School Staff. 129
Staff Understanding and Acceptance of P.L. 94-142 129
Instructional 129
Results. 129
Discussion 129
Administrative. 130
Results. 130
Discussion 131
Impact upon Future Operations.. 131
Need for Additional Facilities 131
Results 131
Discussion. 131
Establishment of a Waiting List. 132
Results 132
Discussion. 132
Early Return to the Public Sector. 132
Results 132
Discussion. 133
Increased Cooperation with Other Agencies, Current. 133
Results 134
Discussion. 134
Increased Interaction with Other Agencies, Future 135
Results 135
Discussion. 135
Change in Existing Philosophy. 136
Results 136
Discussion. 136
Overview of Impact of P.L. 94-142 137
Summary. 138

V. THE INTERVIEWS

Discussion 139
Summary. 142

VI. SUMMARY, WEAKNESSES, AND HEURISTIC QUALITIES OF THE STUDY

Summary. 143
Weaknesses of the Study. 146
Heuristic Qualities of the Study 147
Postscript 147

APPENDICES

A. A review of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 149
B. The Private Special Education School and Public Law 94-142; A Survey. 154
C. Interview Format. 164
D. Number of Respondents from Each State Included in The Survey. 167

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 169

VITA

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The role of the private school in American education has been significant, especially as that role relates to handicapped children. In the years prior to 1975, problems experienced by the public sector in successfully programming for such students resulted in the establishment of a growing number of private schools providing day and/or residential facilities for the handicapped.

Traditionally, such schools have been supported by public subscription, various charities, and by local, state, and federal--or third party--monies. Such fundings have been in addition to student tuition or expense fees which could range from less than $100 to more than $10,000 per school year, depending upon the setting and the services available (18:89).

While the United States always placed high value upon the availability and the quality of its public education, Congress noted, in 1975, that some 1,750,000 physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped children were receiving absolutely no education. Another 2,200,000 were receiving an education inappropriate to their needs (2:10).

With such date before it, Congress passed Public Law 94-142, the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act," in 1975, mandating that all handicapped children would receive a free, appropriate education.

As programs for handicapped children subsequently have grown within the public sector, there has been an almost parallel growth of private schools to serve those children for whom public education has been less successful, even in the presence of P.L. 94-142.

To date, the impact upon the private sector of the Congressional mandate embodied in P.L. 94-142 has not been known.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to review the impact of the Congressional mandates embodies in P.L. 94-142 upon selected, private, special education schools.

A number of questions were addressed:

1.0 What was the composition of the responding school, i.e., campus of one building or more, structure of governing body, nature of funding, etc.?

2.0 In the years following its passage, did the Law result in an increased enrollment among those private, special education schools selected for the study?

- 2.1 If so, how great was that increase?
- 2.2 What type of student characterized that increase?
- 2.3 From where did (s)he come?

3.0 If an increase in enrollments was experienced, and if the school's population later reflected a broader range of handicapping conditions, was there any change in the philosophy upon which the institution had been founded?

4.0 If an increase in enrollments was experienced, and if the school's population later reflected a broader range of handicapping conditions, was there any change in the accountability?

5.0 What was the level of understanding and acceptance of P.L. 94-142 by the institution's administration and instructional staff?

6.0 What new demands were placed upon the school as a direct result of accepting more students covered by the man-

dates of P.L. 94-142?

7.0 What was the institution's position relative to increased future involvement with the federal government: and

8.0 What problems were perceived for the future if there were to be continued adherance to P.L. 94-142?

Population

Private, special education schools in the following western states were studied: Arizona; California; Colorado; Hawaii; Idaho; Montana; Nevada; New Mexico; Oregon; Utah; Washington; and Wyoming. Numbers of respondents from ech state are noted in Apendix D.

Procedure

Departments of Education in each of the selected states were asked to provide the Examiner (E) with a listing of all private, special education schools in their respective states. Once received, these rosters were compared by E with listings noted in the Directory of Educational Facilities for the Learning Disabled (4:1ff), The directory for Exceptional Children (3:1ff), and The Handbook of Private Schools (6:1ff). Appropriate deletions and additions were made to determine a truly contemporary compendium of private, special education schools in the selected states.

Upon finalization of the directory, each listed institution was mailed a copy of "The Private Special Education School and Public Law 94-142; A Survey" (Apendix B). A total of 121 institutions was reflected on the final mailing list.

During June and July, 1980, E also carried out personal inter-

views with the executive directors of three private special education schools. A copy of the standardized "Interview Format" is to be found in Apendix C.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Completed data were received from 77 respondents of 63.6 percent of the original population. These informations were compiled on a master chart by E and, in turn, were translated onto computer programming cards and analyzed by a scanning procedure through the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Computer Center, with the cooperation of John Van Vactor and the Department of Special Education. Results subsequently were reflected in tabular form.

Definition of Terms

"Special Education" was understood to be services provided above and beyond regular curricular offerings to those students who, for whatever reason, were not benefitting from existing programming.

"Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act" referred to federal legislation passed in 1975, guaranteeing a free, appropriate education to all handicapped children.

"The private school (or sector)" was understood to be education within a non-public setting wherein supportive funds were not primarily derived from a local tax base, local district, state department of education, or from federal sources. Governance was by means of various models, usually with an executive director or its equivalent and a volunteer, non-salaried Board of Directors.

"The public school (or sector)" referred to that educational

setting wherein supportive funds primarily derived from a local tax base, local district, state department of education, and/or from federal sources. Governance was by a publicly elected, publicly paid official and a Board of Trustees which may or may not have been salaried.

Those individuals providing quasi-professional services to children within a classroom while yet themselves being students in training at a college or univeristy were identified as "Interns."

Staff members not holding a baccalaureate or advanced degree but carrying out services to children under supervision of a certified instructor, i.e., moving from site to site and implementing an instructor-prepared program of adaptive physical education, were referred to as "Paraprofessionals."

"Supportive personnel" was understood to include those individuals qualified by training to offer services in addition to the traditional curricular content, i.e., speech and language therapy, counseling, etc.

Any child reflecting subaverage intellectual potential, occurring during the developmental period, and manifesting itself in maladaptive behavior was referred to as "mentally handicapped."

"Emotional disturbance" was understood to be that condtion wherein the child's internal tensions and anxieties were at such a level that they interferred with his/her benefitting from the existing school program, necessitating special interventions.

"Learning disabilities" referred to those conditions reflected by the child with average and above average intellectual potential

and who was two or more grade levels below expectancy in two or more content areas.

Those individuals organized together for a single cause--to obtain quality education for exceptional children--were identified as "Advocacy groups."

Summary

This chapter reviewed the need for, and purpose of, the study, along with the population studied, procedures followed, statistical treatment of data, and definitions of terms.

The following chapter will address a review of selected literature.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Evolution of the American Private School

It is of interest to note that, with one exception, there exists no formal chronicaling of the private school movement in this country.

For a comprehensive review of Amrican private schools in historical perspective, the reader is referred to chapters one through three of Kraushaar's excellent book, American Non-public Schools (11:3-88). What follows is a succinct chronology of the evolution of the independent private school in the United States.

During the latter part of the 18th century and through the end of the 19th century, some 16 private boarding schools--all accepting only boys--were established in the United States. In temporal order, these included:

> Andover (1778), Exeter (1783), Episcopal High School (1839), and Woodberry Forestr School (1889) in Virginia; Hill School (1851), St. Paul's (1856), St. Mark's (1865), Lawrenceville (1883), Groton (1884), St. George's (1896), Middlesex (1901), Deerfield (1903) and Kent School (1906) in Massachusetts (10:56).

With the preceding as models, subsequent private schools reflected emphases ranging from the overpreparation of Round Hill School in Massachusetts-which survived but a three-year period and finally closed in 1834--to establishment of the United States Military and Naval Academies in 1802 and 1850 respectively, to Greenfield Hill Academy for Girls in Connecticut in 1785. Next to emerge was the "Country School" concept, followed by day school groups advo-

cating specific educational philosophies, then by that group which probably had the greatest influence upon development of private schools, those adhering to the so-called "progressive school movement" (10:83).

Finally, inner-city schools and multi-ethnic centers were followed by "free schools," using any setting possible, from barns to private homes, to espouse a particular model, i.e., Montessori or Summerhill (10:83-88).

Evolution of the American Special Education Movement

Initiation of educational services for the handicapped can be traced to 1817 with establishment of the American Asylum for the Eudcation and Instruction for the Deaf and Dumb in Hartford, Connecticut (10:173). While the Hartford school later became public, it subsequently was followed by such private institutions as the Clarke School for the Deaf in Northampton, Massachusetts, Lexington School for the Deaf in New York, and the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis (10:174).

A decade and a half later saw formation in Massachusetts of the Perkins Institute for the Blind (10:228). Since establishment of Perkins, most states have undertaken residential schools for the blind under either private or public auspi es (2:87).

Later, in 1948, the first institution for the mentally retarded in the Unied States was organized, again in Massachusetts. As with agencies serving othe handicapping conditions, both public and private, institutions for the retarded have been built since .hat

date in most of the states.

Evolution of the American Private Special Education School

It is estimated that from 12,000 to 15,000 private schools servcing handicapped children presently exist in the United States. Quality varies from that which resembles babysitting to programs reflecting a high level of academic excellence. Facilities range from private homes and condemned schools to model, modern buildings. (18:90).

The precise, sequential steps in this evolution, however, have yet to be placed in historical perspective.

To gain some insights, the writer spoke on three occasions with Newcombe Rice of Santa Fe, New Mexico, a founder and past president of the National Association for Private Special Education Schools (NAPSEC).

According to Rice, and excepting the institutional-type residential setting accepting one specific category, i.e., mentally handicapped, the American private special education school did not become evidence until the late 1950's. At that time, an increased awareness by the public of various handicapping conditions was encouraged by the passage of various pieces of legislation by he federal Congress.

Prior to such legislation, however--which ultimately allowed states to make monies available to districts for "tuitioning out" certain types of handicapped students--a few private special education schools had begun to appear in some eastern states. Such an advent was taking place because local districts simply did not choose

to implement programs for special children, resulting in the states then paying for the education of such individuals within the private sector. Pennsylvania and Virginia were examples of such settings.

Rice recalled that, by 1967, there were approximately one hundred private schools in American which accepted handicapped children. In 1972, the number had grown significaly and NAPSEC was reorganized from a relatively loose-knit group of schools into its present highly structured format. Emphasis continues to be placed upon self-study, self-regulation, and quality control.

A set of comprehensive standards regulating all the private special education schools in the country does not exist, according to Rice; rather, standards are determined by the state in which the school is located.

A trend would appear to be underway, however. Rice noted that an increased number of state associations is becoming evident, associations which reflect membership of the various private special education schools within the particular state. In turn, these state groups are becoming memers of the National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children (NAPSEC). Goals of this latter organization include standardization of guidelines relative to regulation and operation of the private special education schools in America.

Pre-P.L. 94-142 Legislation for the Handicapped

Federal legislation relative to handicapped individuals in the United Staes had its origin in 1958 with the passage of P.L. 85-926,

providing financial support for the preparation of professional personnel to work with the mentally retarded. Funding for the training of individuals to teach deaf children was provided by P.L. 87-276, passed in 1961. The deaf also benefitted from media services made available by monies included in the Cooperative Research Act and P.L. 85-905. In 1963, the training of teachers and administrators in all areas of handicapping conditions became reality when President John F. Kennedy signed P.L. 88-164 (7:1).

Services to handicapped children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools became available in 1966 with Congressional establishment of Title VI under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). No provision for extensive control was included. That same year also saw Congress establish the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) within the U.S. Office of Education or USOE (7:1).

As concerns for education of all handicapped children were manifested across the United States, and with BEH within the USOE, Congress moved quickly to develop new plans and enlarge upon those already in existence. Within one year--1967--legislation was enacted creating the Physical Education and Training Act, and expansion of the Captioned Films for the Deaf Program to include all handicapped individuals. Then percent of the Grants to te States was designated for vocational education, while 15 percent of the same Grants was set aside for Title III of the ESEA. One year later, passage of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act was achieved. Here, for the first time, Congress attempted to exert control over the devlopment of local special education programs by providing funds

for a specific type of educational activity (7:2).

During the same period, support was provided for regular classroom instructors and related personnel by Congress designating tha 15 percent of the funds under the Eudcation Professions Development Act (EPDA) be used for programs to train these individuals to work more effectively with the handicapped.

All legislation for the handicapped was localized under a single authority with the passage of Public Law 91-230, Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in 1970. Within Title VI, Part D was noted as "Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped." Funding was authorized through June 30, 1973. Public Law 93-380, passed in 1974, then extended this funding through the end of fiscal year 1977. It was extended for another five years by passage of Public Law 95-49, encacted in 1977.

With the enactment of Public Law 93-380, federal control over state expenditure of federal monies was sharply increased, as was federal control over administration of special education programs. The 1974 amendment to the "Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act" increased previous legislation "in order to provide full educational opportunities to all handicapped children (7:2).

It was in 1973, however, that perhaps the most significant piece of legislation prior to Public Law 94-142 was enacted. During that year, Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act, which contained the far-reaching Section 504 and its mandate that "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States...shall solely

by reason of his handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (2:13 and Appendix A). Thus, did the federal government place direct control over the administration of special education programs whenever any state educational agency received federal funds, regardless of the source of those funds.

Public Law 94-142 and Its Relevancy to the Private School

Passed in 1975, P.L. 94-142, the "Education of All Handicapped Children Act" (17:42474-42518), is a milestone in American education. While too complex to be detailed in this writing, its most salient features will be reviewed and those pertinent to private schools will be documented specifically. For a comprehensive overview of the Law and its social and legal antecedants, the reader's attention is directed to the writings of Hoffman (8:415-23), Kauffman (9:107-43), Martin (12:132-35, 13:1ff), Sarason and Doris (14:1ff), and Townsend and Mattson (15:75-90).

In addition to the establishment of procedures for requesting of funds by local and state education agencies, the Law mandates that all handicapped children must have available to them a free, appropriate education, emphasizing special education and all related services designed to meet their unique needs. Procedures are carfully presented relative to identification of the handicapped, development of individualized education programs, protection of the rights of handicapped children and their parents, and procedures for due pro-

by reason of his handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (2:13 and Appendix A). Thus, did the federal government place direct control over the administration of special education programs whenever any state educational agency received federal funds, regardless of the source of those funds.

Public Law 94-142 and Its Relevancy to the Private School

Passed in 1975, P.L. 94-142, the "Education of All Handicapped Children Act" (17:42474-42518), is a milestone in American education. While too complex to be detailed in this writing, its most salient features will be reviewed and those pertinent to private schools will be documented specifically. For a comprehensive overview of the Law and its social and legal antecedants, the reader's attention is directed to the writings of Hoffman (8:415-23), Kauffman (9:107-43), Martin (12:132-35, 13:1ff), Sarason and Doris (14:1ff), and Townsend and Mattson (15:75-90).

In addition to the establishment of procedures for requesting of funds by local and state education agencies, the Law mandates that all handicapped children must have available to them a free, appropriate education, emphasizing special education and all related services designed to meet their unique needs. Procedures are carfully presented relative to identification of the handicapped, development of individualized education programs, protection of the rights of handicapped children and their parents, and procedures for due pro-

by reason of his handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (2:13 and Appendix A). Thus, did the federal government place direct control over the administration of special education programs whenever any state educational agency received federal funds, regardless of the source of those funds.

Public Law 94-142 and Its Relevancy to the Private School

Passed in 1975, P.L. 94-142, the "Education of All Handicapped Children Act" (17:42474-42518), is a milestone in American education. While too complex to be detailed in this writing, its most salient features will be reviewed and those pertinent to private schools will be documented specifically. For a comprehensive overview of the Law and its social and legal antecedants, the reader's attention is directed to the writings of Hoffman (8:415-23), Kauffman (9:107-43), Martin (12:132-35, 13:1ff), Sarason and Doris (14:1ff), and Townsend and Mattson (15:75-90).

In addition to the establishment of procedures for requesting of funds by local and state education agencies, the Law mandates that all handicapped children must have available to them a free, appropriate education, emphasizing special education and all related services designed to meet their unique needs. Procedures are carfully presented relative to identification of the handicapped, development of individualized education programs, protection of the rights of handicapped children and their parents, and procedures for due pro-

cess, should these rights be perceived as being violated.

Of particular relevance to the private, special education school would seem to be Part B, Sub. C, Section 121A, 302, which notes:

> If placement in a public or private residential program is necessary to provide special education and related services to a handicapped child the program, including non-medical care and room and board, must be at no cost to the parents of the child.

It is subpart D of Part B of P.L. 94-142 which specifically addresses the private school.

> Each State educational agency shall insure that a handicapped child who is placed in or referred to a private school or facility by a public agancy:
> (a) Is provided special education and related services:
> (1) In conformance with an individualized education program which meets the requirements under 121a.340-121a.349 of Subpart C;
> (2) At no cost to the parents; and
> (3) At a school or facility which meets the standards that apply to State and local educational agencies (including the requirements in this part); and
> (b) Has all of the rights of a handicapped child who is served by a public agency.
>
> Sec. 121a.402 Implementation by State educational agency.
>
> In implementing Section 121a.401, the State educational agency shall:
> (a) Monitor compliance through procedures such as written reports, on-site visits, and parent questionnaires;
> (b) Disseminate copies of applicable standards to each private school and facility to which a public agency has referred or placed a handicapped child; and
> (c) Provide an opportunity for those private schools and facilities to participate in the development and revision of State standards

which apply to them.

Sec. 121a.403 Placement of children by parents.

(a) If a handicapped child has available a free appropriate public education and the parents choose to place the child in a private school or facility, the public agency is not required by this part to pay for the child's education at the private school or facility. However, the public agency shall make services available to the child as provided under Sec. 121a.450-121a.460.

(b) Disagreements between a parent and a public agancy regarding the availavility of a program appropriate for the child, and the question of financial responsibility, are subject to the due process procedures under Sec. 121a.500-121a.514 of Subpart E.

Handicapped Children in Private Schools Not Placed or Referred by Public Agencies

Sec. 121a.450 Applicability of Sec. 121a.451-121a.460.

As used in Sec. 121a.451-121a.460, "private school handicapped children" means handicapped children enrolled in private schools or facilities other than handicapped children covered under Sec. 121a.400-121a.403.

Sec. 121a.451. State educational agency responsibility.

The State educational agency shall insure that:

(a) To the extent consistent with their number and location in the State, provision is made for the participation of private school handicapped children in the program assisted or carried out under this part by providing them with special education and related services; and

(b) The other requirements in Sec. 121a.452-121a.460 are met.

Sec. 121a.452 Local education agency responsibility.

(a) Each local educational agency shall provide special education and related services designed to meet the needs of private school handicapped children residing in the jurisdiction of the agency.

(b) Each local educational agency shall provide private school handicapped children with genuine opportunities to participate in special education and related services consistent with the number of those children and their needs.

Sec. 121a.453 Determination of needs, number of children, and types of services.

The needs of private school handicapped children, the number of them who will participate under this part, and the types of special education and related services which the local educational agency will provide for them must be determined after consultation with persons knowledgeable of the needs of these children on a basis comparable to that used in providing for the participation under this part of handicapped children enrolled in public schools.

Sec. 121a.454 Service arrangements.

Services to private school handicapped children may be provided through such arrangements as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and the provision of mobile educational services and equipment.

Sec. 121a.455 Differences in services to private school handicapped children.

A local educational agency may provide special education and related services to private school handicapped children which are different from the special education and related services it provides to public school children, if:

(a) The differences are necessary to meet the special needs of the private school handicapped children, and

(b) The special education and related services are comparable in quality, scope, and opportunity for the participation to those provided to public school children with needs of equal importance.

Sec. 121a.456 Personnel.

(a) Public school personnel may be made available in other than public school facilities only to the extent necessary to provide services required by the handicapped children for those needs those services were designed, and only when

those services are not normally provided by the private school.

(b) Each State or local educational agency providing services to children enrolled in private schools shall maintain continuing administrative control and direction over those services.

(c) The services provided with funds under Part B of the Act for eligible handicapped children enrolled in private schools may not include: (1) The payment of salaries of teachers or other employees of private schools except for services performed outside their regular hours of duty and under public supervision and control; or

(2) The construction of the private school facilities.

Sec.121a.457 Equipment.

(a) Equipment acquired with funds under Part B of the Act may be placed on private school premises for a limited period of time, but the title to and administrative control over all equipment must be reatained and exercised by a public agency.

(b) In exercising administrative control, the public agency shall keep records of and account for the equipment, and shall insure that the equpment is used solely for the purposes of the program or project, and remove the equipment from the private school premises if necessary to avoid its being used for other purposes or if it is no longer needed for the purposes of the program or project.

Sec. 121a.458 Prohibition of segregaion.

Programs or projects carried out in public facilities, and involving joint participation by eligible handicapped children enrolled in public schools, may not include classes that are separated on the basis of school enrollment or the religious affiliations of the children.

Sec. 121a.459 Funds and property not to benefit private schools.

Funds provided under Part B of the Act and property derived from those funds may not inure to the benefit of any private school.

Sec. 121a.460 Existing level of instruction.

Provisions for serving private school handi-

capped children may not include the financing of the existing level of instruction in the private schools.

Summary

A review of available literature has noted the emergence of the American private school in the late eighteenth century and its subsequent growth into the current century. Advent of the originally private institution designed or intended for a specific type of handicap, i.e., mentally handicapped, originated with the American Asylum for the Education and Instruction for the Deaf and Dumb in 1817. This was followed by a variety of other institutions serving other handicaps until virtually all of the states currently include them as providing services to the special individual. Today, however, what originally began within the private sector generally is a public facility.

Evaluation of the private special education school was motivated essentially by a series of federal laws which made monies available for the education of special children. While such shcools are not regulated by any national standards, they are controlled by state statutes. Currently, a trend would seem to be evident, suggesting movement by the various states toward national affiliation and increased standardization of control and operations.

Also reviewed was the federal legislation which had a significant impact upon education of special children prior to enactment of P.L. 94-142; those portions of the Law specific to the private sector were detailed. An overview of Section 540 is to be found in Appendix A.

The following Chapter will consist of a presentation of results of the study's Survey.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

TABLE 1

GENERAL SCHOOL SETTING

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Affiliation	
Church	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
Non-Church	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX71=92%
Population of Community	
Less than 10,000	XXXX 4 = 5%
10,000 - 50,000	XXXXXXXXX 10 = 13%
50,000 - 100,000	XXXXX 5 = 6%
100,000 - 250,000	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 14 = 18%
Greater than 250,000	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 43 = 56%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%
Campus	
Single	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 2

AFFILIATIONS AND ACCREDITATIONS

VAPIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
State Licensed/Approved	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 50 = 65%
Non-State Licensed	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
*Other	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 45 = 58%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%

*Responses reported by 45 schools listing "Other" included affiliations with and/or accreditation by; State Department of Health (8), hospital or Champus accreditation (4), National and State Associations of Private Schools (2), Diocese or church accreditation (2), Child Welfare League of America (2), ESSA/CACCW/CPCCA (2), Bannatyne Learning Center International (1), Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (1), JCAH Utah (1), Schools noting "Other" but specifying no affiliation (32).

TABLE 3

GOVERNANCE

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Non-Profit Only	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 24 = 31%
Non-Profit/Board of Directors	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%
Non-Profit/Board of Directors/Professional Advisory Board	XXXXXXXXXX 11 = 15%
Non-Profit/Professional Advisory Board	XXXX 4 = 5%
*Non-Profit/Other	XXX 3 = 4%
Profit Only	XXXX 4 = 5%
Profit/Board of Directors	X 1 = 1%
No Answer	XXX 3 = 4%

TABLE 4

FULLTIME ADMINISTRATION

VARIABLE	Number of Full Time Personnel			
Executive Director	31=40%	44=57%	2=3%	-0-
Director	36=47%	28=36%	7=9%	6=8%
Assistant Director	50=65%	24=31%	2=3%	1=1%
Principal	61=79%	14=18%	2=3%	-0-
Headmaster	72=94%	4= 5%	1=1%	-0-
Business Manager	58=75%	19=25%	-0-	-0-
Accountant	58=75%	16=21%	3=4%	-0-
Admissions Director	67=87%	9=12%	1=1%	-0-
*Other	63=82%	11=14%	3=4%	-0-

*The 15 positions reported by schools as "Other" included; Administrative Assistant (3), Program Coordinator (2), Curriculum Coordinator (2), Curriculum Programmer (1), Controller (1), Chief Financial Officer (1), Bookkeeper (1), Case Manager (1), Residential Supervisor (1), Clinical Coordinator (1), Education Director (1), Medical Director (1), Nutritionist (1), Assistant to Principal (1), Aide Supervisor (1).

TABLE 5

PARTTIME ADMINISTRATION

VARIABLE	Number of Parttime Personnel 0	1	2	3+
Executive Director	68= 88%	8=10%	1=1%	-0-
Director	64= 83%	9=12%	4=5%	-0-
Assistant Director	72= 94%	5= 7%	-0-	-0-
Principal	77=100%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Headmaster	77=100%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Business Manager	68= 88%	9=12%	-0-	-0-
Accountant	57= 74%	19=25%	1=1%	-0-
Admissions Director	74= 96%	3= 4%	-0-	-0-
*Other	65= 84%	10=13%	2=3%	-0-

*Number of positions reported by 12 schools as "Other" included; Controller (2), Program Coordinator (1), Records Coordinator (1), Curriculum Programmer (1), Bookkeeper (1), Residential Supervisor (1), Clinical Coordinator (1), Education Director (1), Administrative Assistant (1), Medical Director (1), Nutritionist (1), Outpatient Director (1), Aide Supervisor (1).

TABLE 6

FULLTIME SUPPORT PERSONNEL

VARIABLE	Number of Personnel 0	1	2	3+
Psychologist	69=89%	8=10%	3=4%	5= 7%
Psychiatrist	75=97%	1= 1%	-0-	1= 1%
Physician	75=97%	2= 3%	-0-	-0-
Nurse	68=88%	7= 9%	1=1%	1= 1%
*Other	57=74%	6= 8%	2=3%	12=16%

*Number of positions reported by 20 schools as "Other" included; Social Worker (17), Occupational Therapist (15), Speech Therapist (11), Adaptive Physical Education Specialist (6), Counselor (5), Child Care Worker (4), Psychiatric Technician (4), Marriage Family Counselor (1).

TABLE 7

PARTTIME SUPPORT PERSONNEL

VARIABLE	Number of Personnel 0	1	2	3+
Psychologist	46=60%	22=29%	6=8%	3= 4%
Psychiatrist	51=66%	22=29%	3=4%	1= 1%
Physician	61=79%	12=16%	3=4%	1= 1%
Nurse	64=83%	12=16%	1=1%	-0-
*Other	50=65%	11=14%	5=7%	11=14%

*Number of part time positions reported by 27 schools as "Other" included; Speech/Communication Therapist (22), Occupational Therapist (15), Education Therapist (11), Social Worker (9), Counselor (8), Primary Therapist (8), Physical Therapist (5), Child Care Worker (7), Adaptive Physical Education Specialist (5), Marriage and Family Counselor (3), Developmental Opthalmologist (2), Psychiatric Technician (1), Dance Therapist (1), Vocational Education Specialist (1), Play Therapist (1), Medical Coordinator (1).

TABLE 8

FACULTY-STAFF

TOTAL FACULTY STAFF	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 23 = 30%
5 - 8	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
9 - 12	XXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
13 - 15	XX 2 = 3%
16+	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

TOTAL CERTIFIED STAFF	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 30 = 39%
5 - 8	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 23 = 30%
9 - 12	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
13 - 15	XXXX 4 = 5%
16+	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

FACULTY CERTIFIED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 37 = 48%
5 - 8	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
9 - 12	XXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
13 - 15	XX 2 = 3%
16+	XX 2 = 3%
No Answer	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

FACULTY CERTIFIED IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
5 - 8	XXXXX 5 = 7%
9 - 12	XX 2 = 3%
13 - 15	X 1 = 1%
16+	0
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 49 = 64%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

FACULTY CERTIFIED IN SECONDARY EDUCATION	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 18 = 23%
5 - 8	XXX 3 = 4%
9 - 12	0
13 - 15	0
16+	0
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

NON-CERTIFIED STAFF INTERNS	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
5 - 8	XXXXX 5 = 7%
9 - 12	0
13 - 15	0
16+	0
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 52 - 68%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

NON-CERTIFIED STAFF PARA PROFESSIONALS	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 26 = 34%
5 - 8	XXXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
9 - 12	XXXX 4 = 5%
13 - 15	X 1 = 1%
16+	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 28 = 36%

TABLE 8 - Continued

FACULTY-STAFF

OTHER	Number of Schools Reporting
1 - 4	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%
5 - 8	XXX 3 = 4%
9 - 12	X 1 = 1%
13 - 15	0
16+	0
No Answer	XXXXXXX

TABLE 9

CERTIFIED TEACHER-PUPIL RATIO

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Less than 4:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
4:1 to 5:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX 14 = 18%
6:1 to 8:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 25 = 33%
9:1 to 10:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
Greater than 10:1	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 10

TOTAL ADULT-PUPIL RATIO

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Less than 4:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 41 = 53%
4:1 to 5:1	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
6:1 to 8:1	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
9:1 to 10:1	XXX 3 = 4%
Greater than 10:1	X 1 = 1%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXX 10 = 13%

TABLE 11

FUNDING SOURCES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Tuition Fees	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 55 = 71%
Diagnostic Fees	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 25 = 33%
Endowments	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
Private Foundations	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 30 = 39%
Federal Grants	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
State Grants	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 24 = 31%
Local School District	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 48 = 62%
Auxiliary Monies	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 29 = 38%
Public Subscriptions	0
*Other	XXXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
No Answer	0

*Sources of funding reported by the 12 schools as "Other" included; United Way (4), University Funds (2), Community Mental Health Funds (2), Private Donations (2), Remedial Center After School Program (1), Children's Center Services (1), State Voucher (1), Contract for Behavior Disabilities (1), State Fees (1), Special Education Contracts (1).

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY OF FUNDING SOURCES AVAILABLE TO EACH SCHOOL

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
One Source	XXXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
Two Sources	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
Three Sources	XXXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
Four Sources	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX 14 = 18%
Five Sources	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
Six Sources	XXXXX 5 = 7%
Seven Sources	XXXX 4 = 5%
Eight Sources	XXXX 4 - 5%

TABLE 13

PROPORTION OF VARIOUS SOURCES OF TUITION FEES

PUBLIC LAW 94-142	Number of Schools Reporting
0 - 25%	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
26 - 50%	XXXXX 5 = 7%
51 - 75%	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
76 - 100%	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 31 = 40%

TABLE 13 - Continued

PROPOSITION OF VARIOUS SOURCES OF TUITION FEES

SCHOLARSHIPS	Number of Schools Reporting
0 - 25%	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 18 = 23%
26 - 50%	X 1 = 1%
51 - 75%	0
76 - 100%	0
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 58 = 75%

TABLE 13 - Continued

PROPORTION OF VARIOUS SOURCES OF TUITION FEES

PARENTS	Number of Schools Reporting
0 - 25%	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
26 - 50%	XXXXX 5 = 7%
51 - 75%	XXXX 4 = 5%
76 - 100%	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 44 = 58%

TABLE 13 - Continued

PROPORTION OF VARIOUS SOURCES OF TUITION FEES

OTHER	Number of Schools Reporting
0 - 25%	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
26 - 50%	XX 2 = 3%
51 - 75%	XXXX 4 = 5%
76 - 100%	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 54 = 70%

TABLE 14

FISCAL BUDGET BALANCED

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 43 = 56%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 31 = 40%
No Answer	XXX 3 = 4%

TABLE 15

SOURCES TO RESOLVE FISCAL DEFICIT

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Endowment Funds	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
Foundation Monies	XXXXXXXXXX 10 = 13%
Auxiliary Monies	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX 15 = 19%
Public Subscription	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
*Other	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%

*Sources of funds reported as "Other" included; United Way (4), Private Donations (2), Board Fund Raising (2), Reserve Funds (1), Personal Investment (1), Borrowing (1), Owner's "Kick In" (1).

TABLE 16

TUITION RATE

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
10 Month Schools	
$ 50 - $100 Month	XXXX 4 = 5%
$100 - $200 Month	XXX 3 = 4%
More than $200 Month	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 33 = 43%
12 Month Schools	
$ 50 - $100 Month	X 1 = 1%
$100 - $200 Month	X 1 = 1%
More than $200 Month	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 21 = 28%
*Other	XXX 3 = 4%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%

*The 3 schools listing "Other" included; Free (2), Sliding Scale (1).

TABLE 17

SCHOLARSHIPS PER SCHOOL YEAR

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
One to Five	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 19 = 25%
Five to Ten	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
Ten	XXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
Based on Need	XX 2 = 3%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 39 = 50%

TABLE 18

AVERAGE VALUE OF EACH SCHOLARSHIP

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
$ 200 - $ 500	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
$ 500 - $1,000	XXXXX 5 = 7%
$1,000 - $1,500	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%
More than $1,500	XXXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
Based on Need	XX 2 = 3%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 42 = 54%

TABLE 19

CURRICULA

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
General Academics	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 54 = 70%
Adaptive Physical Education	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 39 = 51%
Diagnostic-Prescriptive	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 20

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Counseling on Site	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 53 = 69%
Counseling Contracted	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%
Speech Therapy	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 54 = 70%
Physical Therapy	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 25 = 33%
*Other	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 26 = 34%
No Answer	XXXXX 5 = 7%

*Supportive Services listed by the 26 schools as "Other" included; Occupational Therapy (10), Art Therapy (3), Adaptive Physical Education (3), Medical (2), Dance Therapy (1), Music (1), Informal Counseling (1), Residential (1), Biofeedback (1), Vocational Training (1), Parent Therapy (1).

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AVAILABLE TO
EACH OF THE SEVENTY-SEVEN REPORTING SCHOOLS

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
One Source	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 15%
Two Sources	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 30 = 39%
Three Sources	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 16 = 21%
Four Sources	XXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
Five Sources	X 1 = 1%
No Answer	XXXXX 5 = 7%

TABLE 22

REFERRAL SOURCES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
From Other Private Schools	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 42 = 55%
From Public Schools	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 23

TYPES OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS ACCEPTED

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Mildly Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 50 = 65%
Moderately Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 56 = 73%
Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 45 = 58%
Mildly Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 38 = 49%
Moderately Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 43 = 56%
Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 32 = 42%
Mildly Severe Mental Retardation	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 22 = 29%
Moderately Severe Mental Retardation	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 18 = 23%
Severe Mental Retardation	XXXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
Any Combination of the Preceding	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 35 = 46%
*Other	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%

*Of the 17 schools reporting "Other", the following additional conditions were listed; Communication Handicaps (3), Autism (3), Physically Handicapped (3), Hearing Impaired (3), Neurologically Impaired (2), Gifted-Learning Disabled (2), Orthopedically Handicapped (1), Severe Multiply Handicapped (2), Developmentally Delayed Infants (1), Downs Syndrome (1), Schizophrenia (1).

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS ACCEPTED BY EACH REPORTING SCHOOL

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS ACCEPTED	Number of Schools Reporting
One Condition	XXXXX 5 = 6%
Two Conditions	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
Three Conditions	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 14 = 18%
Four Conditions	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 16 = 21%
Five Conditions	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
Six Conditions	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
Seven Conditions	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
Eight Conditions	XXXXX 5 = 6%
Nine Conditions	XXX 3 = 4%
Ten Conditions	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 25

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN GRADED AND NON-GRADED SCHOOLS

STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Number of Schools Reporting
Less than 25	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 25 = 32%
25 to 50	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 22 = 29%
50 to 75	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
75 to 100	XXXXX 5 = 6%
100 to 125	XXX 3 = 4%
125 to 150	XX 2 = 3%
Greater than 150	XX 2 = 3%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 26

NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY GRADE LEVEL REPORTED BY THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOLS (N = 2022)*

VARIABLE	0 70 80 90 100 110 120 130 140 150 160 170 180 190 200 300 355
Pre-School	XXXX

TABLE 27

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Impact Noted	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 50 = 65%
No Impact Noted	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 26 = 34%
No Answer	X 1 = 1%

TABLE 28

DIRECTION OF IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Increase in Enrollment	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 31 = 40%
No Increase in Enrollment	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 21 = 27%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 25 = 33%

TABLE 29

DEGREE OF INCREASE OF ENROLLMENT AS RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

INCREASE	Number of Schools Reporting
5 - 10%	XXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
10 - 15%	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%
15 - 25%	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
More than 25%	XXX 3 = 4%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 46 = 60%

TABLE 30

AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142, THE
PROPORTION OF STUDENT POPULATION
INCREASE IDENTIFIED AS MALE

INCREASE	Number of Schools Reporting
20 - 40%	XXXX 4 = 5%
40 - 60%	XXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
More than 60%	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 21 = 27%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 39 = 51%

TABLE 31

PROPORTION OF VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS REFLECTED IN INCREASED ENROLLMENTS AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Mildly Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXX 6 = 8%
Moderately Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
Severe Learning Disabilities	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
Mildly Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
Moderately Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 14 = 18%
Severe Emotional Disturbance	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 19 = 25%
Mildly Severe Mental Retardation	XX 2 = 3%
Moderately Severe Mental Retardation	XXXXX 5 = 6%
Any Combination of the Preceding	XXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
*Other	XXXXXX 6 = 8%

*"Other" included; Behavior problems (2), Multiply Handicapped (2), Autistic (1), Physically Handicapped (1), Profoundly retarded (1).

TABLE 32

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON FINANCIAL STATUS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

IMPACT	Number of Schools Reporting
Has resulted in problems	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%
Has not resulted in problems	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 47 = 61%
No Answer	XXX 3 = 4%

TABLE 33

RESOLUTION OF FINANCIAL PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY REPORTING SCHOOLS AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

RESOLUTION	Number of Schools Reporting
Satisfactory	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 15 = 55%
Not Satisfactory	XXXXXXXXXXX 11 = 41%
No Answer	X 1 = 4%

TABLE 34

MEANS FOR HAVING RESOLVED FINANCIAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY TWENTY-SEVEN REPORTING SCHOOLS AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

MEANS	Number of Schools Reporting
Increased Tuition and Fees	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 15 = 56%
Additonal Public Subscription	XXXXX 5 = 19%
"Tapping" of Investments	X 1 = 4%
Redirection of Endowment Funds	0
Deficit Spending	XXXX 4 = 15%
*Other	XXXX 4 = 15%

*"Other" means included; Fund raising (2), reducing number of staff hours (1), owner's "Kick in" (1).

TABLE 35

PROPOSED MEANS FOR HAVING RESOLVED FINANCIAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY REPORTING SCHOOLS AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Increased Tuition and Fees	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX 15 = 32%
Additional Public Subscription	XXXXXXXX 8 = 17%
"Tapping" of Investments	X 1 = 2%
Redirection of Endowment Funds	0
Deficit Spending	XXXXXX 6 = 13%
*Other	XXXXX 5 = 11%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 26%

*"Other" included; Fund raising (2), Federal Monies, Private Donations (1), "Tap" more directly into PL-142 (1), Grant Application (1).

TABLE 36

EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON FREEDOM OF REPORTING SCHOOLS TO MAINTAIN SINGULAR CONTROL OVER THEIR POLICIES, PROCEDURES, CURRICULAR CONTENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Freedom Reduced	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 26 = 34%
No Reduction of Freedom	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 37

ATTITUDE OF REPORTING SCHOOLS RELATIVE TO RECEIVING CONTINUING DIRECT FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting	
In Favor	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	41 = 53%
Not in Favor	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	30 = 39%
No Answer	XXXXXX	6 = 8%

TABLE 38

FACULTY UNDERSTANDING OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 RELATIVE TO ITS MANDATES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Very Good	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 37 = 48%
Adequate	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%
Inservice Needed	XXXXXXXXXXX 11 = 14%
No Answer	XX 2 = 3%

TABLE 39

FACULTY ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 RELATIVE TO ITS MANDATES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Enthusiastic	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 22 = 28%
Fairly Positive	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 33 = 43%
Neutral	XXXXXXXXXXXXX 13 = 17%
Some Reluctance	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
Very Reluctantly	0
No Answer	XX 2 = 3%

TABLE 40

ADMINISTRATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 RELATIVE TO ITS MANDATES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Very Good	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 49 = 63%
Adequate	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 17 = 22%
Inservice Needed	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%
No Answer	XX 2 = 3%

TABLE 41

ADMINISTRATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 RELATIVE TO ITS MANDATES

VARIABLE	Number of Schools Reporting
Enthusiastic	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 23 = 30%
Fairly Positive	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 31 = 40%
Neutral	XXXXXXXXXXX 12 = 16%
Some Reluctance	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%
Very Reluctantly	X 1 = 1%
No Answer	XXX 3 = 4%

TABLE 42

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS

NEED ADDITIONAL FACILITIES	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 21 = 27%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 47 = 61%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS	
HAD TO ESTABLISH A WAITING LIST	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 20 = 26%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

	CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS
RETURNING STUDENTS TO PUBLIC SECTOR BEFORE FACULTY FELT THEY WERE READY	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 27 = 35%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 41 = 53%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXX 9 = 12%

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

	CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS
EXPECT INCREASED COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 51 = 66%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 19 = 25%
No Answer	XXXXXXX 7 = 9%

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS	
EXPECT INCREASED INTERACTION WITH PARENTS	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 48 = 62%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 23 = 30%
No Answer	XXXXXX 6 = 8%

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

	CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS
EXPECT INCREASED INTERACTION WITH SPECIFIC GROUPS	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 46 = 60%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 23 = 30%
No Answer	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%

TABLE 42 - Continued

IMPACT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 UPON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS OF REPORTING SCHOOLS

CURRENT AND PROJECTED OPERATIONS	
EXPECT CHANGE IN SCHOOLS PREVAILING PHILOSOPHY	Number of Schools Reporting
Yes	XXXXXXXX 8 = 10%
No	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 59 = 77%
No Answer	XXXXXXXXXX 10 = 13%

Summary

Chapter III has presented results of the study without comment.

The following Chaper will present a review and discussion of all findings.

CHAPTER IV

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

Introduction

When data presented in the previous chapter were reviewed and synthesized, two broad groupings emerged, with specific categories identified under each heading.

"Date Relative to Structuring of Reporting Schools" included the following subheadings: 1) Settings and accreditations; 2) Andministration; 3) Personnel; 4) Budgetary considerations; 5) Curricular considerations; 6) Sources and types of students served; 7) Numbers of students enrolled; and 8) Numbers of handicapping conditions served.

"Public Law 94-142" comprised the second broad grouping and had as its specific categories: 1) Impact upon enrollment; 2) Impact upon financial status; 3) Impact upon school control; 4) Impact upon school staff; and 5) Impact upon future operations of the school.

Data Relative to Structuring of Reporting Schools

Settings

Results

Of the seventy-seven private special education schools reflected in the study, seventy-one, or ninety-two percent of all respondents, were identified as non-church affiliated; forty-three were located in communities having a population in excess of 250,000; a majority of schools--fifty-one, or sixty-six percent--was contained

on a single campus; and an almost equal number of respondents noted either single or multi-building facilities--thirty-six, or forty-seven percent, for the former and thirty-two or forty-two percent, for the latter.

Discussion

Of particular interest in these findings was the apparent de-emphasis upon special education schools by church-affiliated groups, at lest within the geographic area studied and according to reporting agencies. Conversations by E with representatives of several local religious denominations supported this observation, suggesting that, generally speaking, parochial schools saw their first responsiblity being to children capable of benefitting from regular education while relying upon the public sector to provide appropriate services for the "special child."

Also implicit within the findings was the suggestion that a community with a fairly large population usually was the setting for the private special education school. This becomes understandable when one considers that private shcool tuitions and related fees cover a rather significant range; employment opportunities must be somehwat extensive, stable and ensure a good income. Such oportunities probably are more common in the larger communities.

Too, it can hypothesized that the large community--with its suspected acceleration of economic opportunities--probably contributed to forty-two percent of the responding schools having a financial affluence which permitted multi-buildings and/or campuses.

Accreditations

Results

Of the seventy-seven reporting schools, fifty--or sixty-five percent of all respondents--noted their having state licensure, while only nine, or twelve percent, stated operation without such approval. Another eighteen schools-twenty-two percent--did not respond to this item.

Discussion

That such a significant majority of responding schools enjoyed licensure by their respective state departments of education would seem to reflect a rather high quality of curricular content. Such a position is supported by a communication between the writer and James Meneth of the Nevada State Department of Education. It was Meneth's observation that state licensing of Nevada's private sector probably is preced by even closer scrutiny of meeting criteria than that directed to the public sector.

An additional indication of the high level of standards maintained by the respondents is reflected among the affiliations recorded by the thirteen schools who noted accreditations above and beyond state licensure. Included were such agencies as state departments of health, CHAMPUS, National and State Associations of Private Schools, Child Welfare League of America, Bannatyne Learning Center International, and Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

Administration

Governance

Results

Of the responding schools, twenty-seven--or thirty-five percent--reported being governed as a non-profit orgainization by a board of directors; an almost equal number, twenty-four--or thirty-one percent--noted structuring as a non-profit orgainization only, with no governing board, per se, using only prevailing state statutes as guidelines. Four respondents--or five percent of the sample--noted themselves as non-profit but with a professional advisory board; while organized as a non-profit but having both a board of directors and a professional advisory board were eleven schools, some fifteen percent of the total sample. Orgianized for profit and with no board of directors were four schools--five percent of the total population studied--while only one respondent, one percet of the total, structured itself for a profit--under the governance of a board of directors. Three schools--four percent of all respondents--identified themselves as non-profit with other unidentified types of governances.

Discussion

That ninety-five percent of all reporting schools reported themselves as being orgainized on a non-profit basis rather clearly dispels any perceptions the general public might have relative to private schools being operated as money-making ventures. In a similar vein, that fifty percent of the respondents were governed by official boards of directors would appear to be a positive reflection

upon the schools' commitment to accountability for their product. This position is further enhanced when it is noted that fifteen percent of the reporting schools also had additional input from professional advisory boards.

Staffing, Fulltime

Results

Executive Director

Relative to fulltime administrative staff, thirty-one schools--or forty percent of all respondents--employed no executive directors while forty-four, or fifty-seven percent of reporting schools, noted one person in such a position; two schools, or three percent of the sample, had two people in that role and no school reported in excess of that number.

Director

Schools noting no director, per se, numbered thirty-six or forty-seven percent of all respondents; one director was recorded by twenty-eight schools, thirty-six percent of the sample, while seven--or nine percent of the total--reported employing two directors; and three or more directors were staffed by six schools, or eight percent of the sample.

Assistant Director

No assistant director was employed by fifty of the reporting schools, or sixty-five percent of the respondents; one person occupied that position in twenty-four schools (thirty-one percent); two individuals were retained as assistant directors in two schools--or three percent of the population studied--and one school (one percent)

having three or more people in that role.

Principal

Some seventy-nine percent of the schools sampled--sixty in number--employed no principal; fourteen respondents--or eighteen percent of the sample--identified one person in that role; two principals were retained at each of two schools (three percent); and one school, or one percent of the sample, reported employing three or more in that position.

Headmaster

Headmasters were reported employed by only five schools; four--or five percent of the population--each employed one; and one school, or one percent of the sample, noted two individuals in that position. A total of seventy-two--or ninety-four percent of the population--did not include the position in their orginizational structure.

Business Manager/Accountant

Three out of every four reporting schools did not employ a business manager; the remaining twenty-five percent of the sample noted one person in that role. Again, seventy-five percent of the respondents noted not employing an accountant; sixteen schools--or twenty-one percent of the sample--each reported one person in that position; and three (four percent) stated they employed two accountants.

Admissions Director

One school noted inclusion of two admissions directors; this was but one percent of the sample. Another nine respondents--or

twelve percent of the population studied--each employed one person for this role; the largest marjority of responding schools, however--some eighty-seven percent--noted no admissions director in their orginizational structure.

Discussion

A certain degree of tradtionalism would seem to be reflected in the organizational structure of the reporting schools. A significant majority noted including the position of executive director and director, but roles of assistant director, principal, and headmaster were included by a minority of respondents, especially the latter postion which was noted by only five schools.

That only one of four respondents utilized the services of a fulltime business manager was unexpected by the writer, as was the finding that a similar ratio was evidenced relative to the position of accountant.

Semantics may have played a role in detemining these data, however, since, under the heading of "Other," such descriptive tems as administrative assistant, program coordinator, controller, chief financial officer, bookkeeper, education director, assistant to the principal, clinical director, curriculum programmer, and case manager were noted. A total of only fourteen such responses was received, though, lending credence to the earlier observation that only the positions of executive director and director consistently were staffed by a majority of schools sampled.

Staffing, Parttime

Results

Executive Director

Use of parttime administrative staff was a significant exception among the respondents. Only eight--or ten percent of reporting institutions--staffed one parttime executive director and but one school--one percent of the sample--noted two individuals within that role.

Director

The position of parttime director was staffed by thirteen respondents, or seventeen percent of those reporting. Of this latter group, nine (twelve percent) reported one person and four schools noted two people in that position.

Assistant Director/Principal/Headmaster

A mere five schools, or seven percent of the population studied, filled the position of assistant director on a parttime basis and none reported parttime personnel in the roles of principal or headmaster.

Business Manager/Accountant

There were nine parttime business managers noted, some twelve percent of the total sample, while one out of four of the reporting schools noted a parttime accountant and one school--one percent of the population studied--staffed two parttime people into that position.

Admissions Officer/Other

Three schools, or four percent of the sample, employed on

parttime admissions officer and twelve respondents listed parttime employees under the headings of controller, program coordinator, records coordinator, curriculum programmer, bookkeeper, clinical coordinator, education director, and administrative assistant.

Disucssion

Again, semantics may have influence these data but results appeared to be quite conclusive; of the reporting schools, and relative to the categories identified on The Survey, trends were away from parttime personnel.

Generally speaking, then, a pattern would seem to have emerged insofar as administrative staffing of the responding schools was concerned: 1) The emphasis was upon maintaining two key positions--executive director and director--on a fulltime basis by a significant majority of the sample; 2) Roles of a lesser importance, or perhaps reflecting lesser responsibilities, were filled less frequently on such a basis, if, indeed, they even were staffed. For the most part, need for, or the ability to employ, fulltime personnel to maintain financial records was not reflected by a majority of the samples; and 3) An almost equal number of schools (14:12) included such roles as education director, program coordinator, records coordinator, etc., on either a full or parttime basis, though such respondents composed a significant minority of the sample (51:26).

Personnel

Because each school included in the sample was committed to a population of students reflecting special needs, the numbers of

support personnel available to meet these needs was of particular interest to E.

Support Staff, Fulltime

Results

Psychologists

Some sixty-nine schools or seventy-nine percent of the respondents, did not employ a fulltime psychologist; eight schools--ten percent of the sample--staffed one individual into that position on a fulltime basis; three--or four percent of all schools remaining--employed two; and five schools, or seven percent of the total population studied, had three or more staffed into that role.

Psychiatrists

Only one school (one percent) employed a fulltime psychiatrist, while another one had three or more fulltime on its staff.

Physicians/Nurses

Two schools, or three percent of the sample, included one fulltime physician while seven respondents, or nine percent of the population investigated, noted one fulltime nurse; one other school (one percent) staffed two fulltime nurses and another respondent had three or more in that position.

Other

Of particular note were the fulltime positions listed by twenty schools under the hearing of "Other." Included here were: social worker, noted in seventeen schools; occupational therapist, recorded fifteen times; speech therapist, noted by eleven respondents; physicial education specialist, listed six times; counselor,

four times; child care worker, on four occasions; psychiatric technician, four times; and marriage family counselor, one time.

Support Staff, Parttime

Results

Psychologists

Some sixty percent of the responding schools, or forty-six in number, did not provide a psychologist on any parttime basis; twenty-two, or twenty-nine percent of the sample, staffed one person in that role under those conditions; six schools (eight percent) had two parttime psychologists; and three respondents, or four percent of the population studied, had three or more parttime personnel in that position.

Psychiatrists

Of all the respondents, two out of every three employed no parttime psychiatrist; twenty-two or twenty-nine percent of the sample, included one such person on a parttime basis; while three schools (four percent) noted two, and one respondent (one percent) included three or more on its supportive staff.

Physicians/Nurses

Employment of the parttime services of a physician was not included in the staff structure of sixty-one schools, or seventy-nine percent of the respondents. Twelve (sixteen percent) noted one individual in that role on parttime status; three others (four percent) reported two; while one (one percent) noted three or more. An even larger number--sixty-four, or eighty-three percent of the sample--employed no nurses on a parttime basis; twelve, or sixteen percent

of the reporting population, staffed one nurse on an other-than-fulltime basis; and one school (one percent) included two in that role under such conditions.

Other

Again the addtional services made available on a parttime basis were rather extensive and included: speech and communications therapist, noted by twenty-two schools; occupational therapist, listed by fifteen respondents; education therapist, eleven schools, social worker, nine times; counselor and primary therapist each by eight schools; child care worker, seven schools; physical therapist and adaptive physical education specialist each by five respondents; marriage and family counselor on three occasions; developmental ophthalmologist by two schools, psychiatrist technician, dance therapist, vocational education specialist, play therapist, and medical coordinator each by one school.

Discussion

The writer admits to a kind of mixed surprise and pleasure when the preceding data were considered. That slightly more than two out of every three schools did not include a fulltime psychologist on their staff, and that only a slightly lower numnber did not staff this position even on a parttime basis was surprising and initially disturbing. Careful consideration, however, led to the supposition that those schools reporting such a staffing pattern probably were the ones who placed primary emphasis upon academic achievement. To teach such a goal, the classroom instructor would be of major importance, a classroom teacher who, in all probability, was highly skil-

led in clinical, diagnostic-prescriptive approaches. If such be so, then the need for a staff psychologist well might be eliminated.

That only two schools included a psychiatrist on their staffs probably can be understood in terms of cost, not to mention that a majority of schools included in this study were day, not residential, settings. Such services are expensive and available to but the most affluent agencies. Such a position would seem to be supported by the data which noted twenty-six schools apparently recognizing the need for psychiatric assistance by their students and providing them on a parttime schedule.

Again, as with psychiatrists, fulltime in-residence services of physicians can be very expensive. This may be one of the major factors underlying why only two of the reporting schools included the position in their staffing patterns, as opposed to sixteen respondents who made such services available on a parttime basis.

That eighty-eight percent of responding schools provided no services by nurses was somewhat of a surprise. Again, however, most of the respondents were non-residential day schools, delimiting the need for such an on-site person. Though nine schools did include the staffing of fulltime nurses in their structuring, a slightly larger number--some thirteen--structured the position into a parttime role. Again, one wonders if this were for purposes of economy or reflected the needs unique to a day school facility.

While numbers of schools providing psychological and related services to their students may have surprised, and perhaps dismayed, the writer, these subjective reactions were offset, to a degree, by

the variety of other services made available in some settings. Admittedly while those listed as fulltime positions were outnumbered by those offered on a parttime basis, the sincere effort to meet the various needs of children was evident. Particularly intriguing was the inclusion by one school on a fulltime basis, and by another school on a parttime basis, of a marriage and family counselor. One wonders if this psotion was predicated upon the premise that a child's success in school is heavily dependent upon successful parent-parent interaction. If this be so, these two schools apparently were making services available to ensure that both the school and home environments were maximally positive.

Instructional Staff, Numbers

Results

In terms of instructional staff, twenty-three schools, or thirty percent of the sample population, reported a total faculty of between one and four individuals; twenty respondents, or twenty-six percent of the population studied, were staffed by a faculty of between five and eight individuals; eleven schools (fourteen percent) had an instructional staff of between nine and twelve people; only two schools, or three percent of the sample, had a faculty of between thirteen and fifteen; and twenty respondents, twenty-six percent of the responding population, reported sixteen or more on their instructional staff.

Discussion

These date would seem to reflect a rather wide range of staffing patterns for instructional purposes by the reporting schools:

Thirty percent had a relatively small number of faculty, some one to four; twenty-six percent had a modestly larger instructional staff of between five and eight; while another twenty-six percent noted the largest number of faculty reported by the sample, sixteen and more.

Instructional Staff, Certificated

Results

General

When the issue of certification was studied, thirty schools, or thirty-nine percent of the sample, noted from one to our of their faculty holding certification or endorsements; another twenty-three (thirty percent) reported between five and eight as certified; from nine to twelve being certified was identified by thirteen, or seventeen percent of the population studied; four schools (five percent) reported between thirteen and fifteen certified faculty; and dsix respondents (eight percent) said sixteen or more of their staff were certified.

These date must be accepted "as is" and without comment because, while the number of certified staff is identified, what proportion that is to the total staff-certified and uncertified--is not known.

Special Education

Looking at certification a bit more specifically, thirty-seven schools, or forty-eight percent of the sample population, noted one to four of their faculty certified in special education; seventeen respondents (twenty-two percent) reported from five to eight of their staff holding such credentials; eleven of the responding schools, or

fourteen percent of the population, had from nine to twelve of their faculty certificated in this area; two respondents (three percent) noted from thirteen to fifteen so credentialed; while another two schools reported sixteen or more of their faculty being certified in special education.

Elementary Education

Turning to elementary education, some twenty schools, or twenty-six percent of the sample, noted one to four of their faculty certified in this area; five respondents (seven percent) had five to eight similarly credentialed; two, or three percent of the population studied, had nine to twelve of their staff certified in this area; and one respondent (one percent) listed thirteen to fifteen holding the elementary education credential.

Secondary Education

Some eighteen schools, or twenty-three percent of the sample, noted one to four of their faculty holding certification in secondary education; another three--or four percent of the population studied--had five to eight of their instructors so certified. No other respondents indicated faculty being credentialed at this level.

Other Areas

Other content areas involving certified personnel included deaf education, with one school reporting twelve individuals; learning handicapped specialist, noted by six respondents; Bannantyne specialist, reported by two schools; rehabilitation, vocational education, physical education, fine arts, early childhood education, communication disorders, music art therapy, and physical therapy,

each reported by one school.

Instructional Staff, Non-Certificated

Results

Interns

When non-certified staff were identified, twenty schools, or twenty-six percent of the population studied, said they included one to four non-certified interns on their staff; another five (seven percent) reported inclusion of from five to eight such personnel on their faculties.

Paraprofessionals

Use of from one to four non-certified paraprofessionals was noted by twenty-six schools, or thirty-four percent of the sample; anothe twelve--sixteen percent of the total population--reported using five to eight such personnel; nine to twelve paraprofessionals were staffed by four respondents, or five percent of the sample; one school (one percent) noted using from thirteen to fifteen people in this role; while sixteen or more were employed by six schools, or eight percent of the total population.

Discussion

The preceding date would seem to suggest that reporting schools were attempting to be accountable to their students. While primarily being special education settings, they also employed a majority of staff certified in that discipline. In a not unexpected occurrence, certification in elementary education composed the second largest category, while the least number of certified staff was to be noted at the secondary level.

Approximately one out of every three reporting schools had the services of students from cooperating colleges and universities who assisted in implementing prescriptive strategies while serving as interns. Additional supplementary services by paraprofessionals were provided by some fifty-nine schools studied, employment of whom ranged from one to four in some settings to as many as sixteen or more at six sites.

Again the writer was pleasantly surprised by the scope of contents reflected in the various credentials held above and beyond special, elementary, and secondary education. Inclusion of personnel certified in such areas as education for the deaf, vocational, rehabilitaion, physical and early childhood education, fine arts, art therapy, music, Bannantyne Principles, etc., speaks highly of the private sector's efforts to provide quality and meaningful content to its learners.

This emphasis upon quality and accountability, however, probably is best reflected in class size and teacher:pupil ratio.

Certified Adult-Student Ratio

Results

Less than four students to one certified specialist was noted by seventeen schools, or twenty-two percent of the sample; fourteen respondents reported a ratio of between four and five students to one certified adult; approximately thirty percent of the sample, or twenty-five schools, stated their adult:student ratio was between six and eight to one; another thirteen respondents, or seventeen percent of the population studies; noted a ratio of between nine and ten to

one; and seven schools, or nine percent of all respondents, had a ratio greater than ten to one.

Total Adult:Student Ratio

Results

When the class size, or adult:student ratio, was detemined by combining all adults--both certified and non-certified--a somewhat different profile emerged. A majority of all respondents, some forty-one schools, or fifty-three percent, noted an adult-student ratio of less than four to one; thirteen schools, or seventeen percent, had a ratio of between four and five to one; another nine (twelve percent) reported their ratio to be between six and eight to one; between nine and ten students to one adult was noted by three schools, or four person greater than ten to one.

Discussion

These data are viewed by the writer as a major relfection of the reporting schools attempting to meet their responsibilities to students. Individualization of programming often is cited as a goal of education; yet with classes in the public sector having between twenty and thrity students, that goal is, at bet, somewhat elusive. Within the classrooms of the schools reporting data in this study, however, individualization can become reality because, in part, the numbers of children served by each adult are small enough to ensure such a realization.

Budgetary Considerations

Funding Sources

Results

When funding sources were reviewed, a variety of patterns was observed. The majority of reporting schools--fifty-five, or seventy-one percent--included tuition fees; another large block of respondents--some sixty-two percent, or forty-eight in number--noted receipt of funds from local school districts; thirty schools, or thirty-nine percent of the sample, had access to monies from private foundations, while a very similar number--twenty-nine, or thirty-eight percent--were at least partially funded from their auxiliaries. Another twenty-five, or thirty-three percent, reported diagnostic fees as a funding source; State grants were available to twenty-four, or thirty-one percent of the repondents; seventeen (twenty-two percent) noted federasl grants as a source of income; while seventeen percent, or thirteen in number, had endowments upon which they could draw; finally, twelve schools (sixteen percent of the sample) included funding from "Other" sources. Among these "Other" sources, United Way was noted kby four schools; community mental health funds, university funds, and private donations each were included by each of two schools; remedial afterschool programs, children's center services, state vouchers, contracts for behavior disabilities, state fees, and special education contracts each were reported by at least one school.

Numbers of Funding Sources Available

With the preceding sources of funding identified, it then

became of interest to determine how many were available to each respondent.

Results

The largest number of reporting schools-twenty, or twenty-six percent--reported two funding sources available; fourteen, or eighteen percent of the sample, had access to four sources; only one source was noted as available to sixteen percent of respondents, or twelve in number, while eleven schools (fourteen percent) could draw upon three sources; five sources were available to seven members of the sample (seven percent); six sources were available to five schools--or seven percent of the population--four schools, or five percent, had access to seven sources; and the same number reported eight sources upon which they could draw.

Funding Sources for Tuition: P.L. 94-142

Results

Further delineation of the verious sources of tuition fees suggested that twenty-six percent of the responding schools, or twenty in number, relied upon Public Law 94-142 for between seventy-six and one hundred percent of its tuition; twelve schools (sixteen percent) received up to twenty-five percent of their tuition monies from the same source; another nine respondents, or twelve percent of the sample, relied upon P.L. 94-142 for from fifty-one to seventy-five percent of all tuition fees; and from twenty-six to fifty percent of such support was recorded by five schools (seven percent). No responce to this question was made by thirty-one schools, or forty percent of the sample.

Funding Sources for Tuition: Scholarships

Results

Scholarships were noted as accounting for up to twenty-five percent of their tuition fees by eighteen schools, or twenty-three percent of the population studied, while one respondent (one percent) reported between from twenty-six to fifty percent of tuition monies derived from similar sources. No answer to this item was noted by three out of every four schools included in the sample popultion.

Funding Sources for Tuition: Parents

Results

Parents were reported as the primary source sof tuition by seventeen respondents, or twenty-two percent of the sample; five schools (seven percent) received from twenty-six to fifty percent of such monies from similar sources; while five percent of the sample--four schools--relied upon parents for from fifty-one to seventy-five percent of their tuition fees; seven respondents, or nine percent of the popultion studied, noted relying upon parents for from seventy-six to one hundred percent of their tuitions. Again a majority of the sample noted no answer to this question.

Funding Sources for Tuition: Other

Results

In addition to Public Law 94-142, scholarships, and parents, nine schools, or twelve percent of the respondents, cited other unidentified sources as accounting for up to twenty-five percent of their tuition fees; eight (ten percent) noted similar sources as accounting for between seventy-six and one hundred percent of their

tuition base; four schools, or five percent of the sample, relied upon such sources for from fifty-one to seventy-five percent of such monies; and from twenty-six to fifty percent of their tuition fees were derived from unidentified other sources by two schools, or three percent of the population studied. No response to this item was recorded oy seventy percent of the sample, or fifty-four schools.

Status of Budget

Once funding sources were identified, attention was directed to the budget status of each respondent.

Results

Of the total popultion studied, a definite majority--some fifty-six percent, or forty-three in number--noted balanced budgets; thirty-one or, forty percent of the sample, noted their budgets as unbalanced; while three schools did not respond to this question.

Of those reporting unbalanced budgets, fifteen schools, or nineteen percent of the total population, planned to use monies provided by their auxiliaries to bring finances into a balanced state; then respondents (thirteen percent) reported being able to draw upon foundation funds; endowment monies were available to seven schools, or nine percent of the sample; and six schools (eight percent) reported relying upon public subscription. "Other" sources were noted by twelve institutions (sixteen percent of the sample) and included United Way by four respondents; private donations and Board fund raising, each by each of two schools; and reserve funds, personal investment, borrowing, and owner's "kick in" each by one school. No answer to this item was recorded by thirty-five percent

of the sample, or twenty-seven in number.

Tuition Schedules

Because of its impact upon the status of a school's budget, actual tuition rates were reviewed next.

Results

Ten-Month Schools

Of those schools operating on a ten-month basis, thirty-three, or forty-three percent of the sample, noted a tuition rate in excess of two hundred dollars per month; four respondents (five percent) had a monthly fee of between fifty and one hundred dollars, while a monthly rate of between one hundred and two hundred dollars per month was recorded by three schools (four percent).

Twelve-Month Schools

Among twelve-month schools, twenty-eight percent of the respondents had a monthly tuition rate greater than two hundred dollars; one school (one percent) had a fee schedule of between fifty and one hundred dollars, while a similar number reported a monthly tuition rate between one hundred and two hundred dollars. Free tuitions were noted by two respondents and one school reported a sliding schedule of fees. No response to this question was recorded by eleven respondents, or fourteen percent of the sample.

Scholarship Awards

In addition to the scheduling of tuition fees, the availability and awarding of scholarships were reviewed.

Results

One out of each four respondents, or nineteen in number,

awarded one to five scholarships; eleven schools, or fourteen percent of the sample reported ten scholarships awarded annually; eight percent of the population studied, or six in number, noted awarding of between six and ten each school year; and two noted no specific number of scholarships available but that awards were based upon need. Again a significant number of the sample population, thirty-nine schools made no response to this question.

Valuation of Scholarships Awarded

Results

Of the scholarships awarded, eleven schools, fourteen percent of the sample, noted their average value to be above fifteen hundred dollars; nine respondents (twelve percent) reported an average value of between two hundred and five hundred dollars; ten percent of the sample, or eight in number cited an average of between ten hundred and fifteen hundred dollars; and five schools, or seven percent of the sample, noted an average value of between five hundred and one thousand dollars. Valuation of the award as based upon financial need was reported by two respondents, or three percent of the sample. Once more, a majority of the population studied, some forty-one schools or fifty-four percent--noted no answer to this item.

Discussion

That a significant number of schools included in the sample used tuition fees as a major source of funding should not be an unexpected finding. That an almost equally large group of respondents-some sixty-two percent--was funded, at least in part, by monies from local school districts was somewhat of a surprise to the writer. The

implication would seem to be that a rather high level of cooperation exists between the public and private sectors, at least between districts and those private special education schools included in this study. To account for such a state of affairs, two considerations might merit attention: 1) For whatever reasons, involved school districts have special education needs they cannot, or choose not to, resolve; and 2) Districts probably are willing to place certain special education students--probably those reflecting severe learning disabilities or severe emotional disturbance--in the private sector and then meet the costs of such placement with monies under Public Law 94-142, finding this more convenient than implementing such programs themselves.

Also worthy of note would seem to be the role of auxiliaries in assisting private special education schools to meet their financial needs. Slightly more than one out of every three respondents noted a dependence upon such sources. An almost equal number of schools was fortunate enough to have financial assistance provided by private foundations.

Generally speaking, reported data reflected a rather diverse range of sources for funding, suggesting a kind of dedication to both quality of content and services provided by the reporting schools and, most certainly, an aggressive approach to obtaining funding to ensure that quality and those services. Not all respondents had access to an equal number of sources, however; the range was from twelve schools having only one source of funding to four who could rely upon as many as eight. Such findings possibly reflected the

unique needs of specific schools, as well as the governing philosophy relative to dependency upon outside sources.

That the enactment of Public Law 94-142 had a positive impact upon the financial status of the schools responding to The Survey seemed to be reflected in the results suggesting that sixty percent of all respondents used such funds as part of their tuition fees. Of that group, no less that one out of every four stated monies from the Law accounted for from seventy-six to one hundred percent of such income.

A somewhat surprisingly small number of schools--only nineteen--included scholarships as sources of tuition monies. In this instance, it was understood that the awards were made by organizations outside the receiving schools, as opposed to being awarded from funds directly available to the schools themselves.

Another insight into the financial structuring of the private special education schools studied was gained by the suggestion that only eight institutions relied totally upon parents for a majority of their tuition income. Only seventeen of the respondents noted receiving up to twenty-five percent of such fees from that source, five receiving up to half of the tuition base from parents; only one school reporting up to seventy-five percent of its tuition coming from that group and seven noted depending upon parents for seventy-six to one hundred percent of such funds.

After Public Law 94-142, scholarships, and parental monies, twenty-three schools noted receiving tuition funds from other unidentified sources. Because of the structuring of The Survey, it

was not known if such sources were in addition to or exclusive of the earlier mentioned sources.

Nor does the writer understand why such a large percentage of schools in the sample population failed to respond to items relative to funding sources. Perhaps The Survey's items were poorly constructed, ambiguous, and/or threatening to the respondee or perhaps they simply were viewed as intruding upon the privacy of the target schools. For whatever reason(s), approximately sixty-one percent of the population studied recorded no answer to questions relative to the proportion of various sources of tuition fees.

A distinctly dissimilar reaction was given to questions relative to the status of budgets and tuition rates. Only three schools failed to report whether their budgets were or were not balanced; some eleven choose not to reveal tuition rates; and twenty-seven noted no answer to the question relative to "Other" sources of tuition funding. Here again, perhaps questions on The Survey were not clear, did not provide enough flexibility for the respondent, or were viewed as intrusions upon institutional privacy.

Of significance was the finding that a majority of reporting schools--some fifty-six percent--reported having balanced budgets. Such a result speaks well for the financial accountability of private special education schools, at least those included in this study.

Of the thirty-one respondents who noted unbalanced budgets, monies from their auxiliaries were reported by fifteen schools as a means for resolving the financial situation. This finding supported earlier results which reflected auxiliaries as being the second most

frequently cited source for general school funding, surpassed only by tuition fees. Earlier results also suggested use of foundation monies as a frequently cited source of general funding; it again was noted as the second most available resource for schools attempting to resolve their fiscal deficits.

Possibly an aggressive, almost tenacious demand for autonomy on the part of the reporting schools was suggested by the finding that only one institution stated it would attempt to resolve its financial deficits by the actual borrowing of monies. Avenues explored by others varied from turning to United Way, Board fund raising, and owners "kicking in," among others.

While still considering financial matters, it is of some interest to look at actual tuition rates. The private school has, as part of its image, an aura of being expensive. Data reported by the population reviewed in this study might tend to support such a position. Of those schools offering a ten-month program, a significant majority noted a monthly tuition fee in excess of two hundred dollars. A similar direction was observed among respondents offering a twleve-month program.

There might be those individuals who would suggest such fees to be rather expensive. The term "expensive," however, may be thought of as relative, especially when consideration is given to earlier results noting the adult:student ratio and breadth of services--both full and parttime--offered by schools in the sample.

In their efforts to assist in the financial expectancies placed upon adults having students enrolled in the sample population,

it was heartening to note the numbers of schools which made scholarships available. Such awards were viewed by the writer as efforts by the respondents to assist in meeting their obligations to parents as well as children.

Curricular Considerations

Generally speaking, respondents noted rather extensive curricular offerings.

Content

Results

A significant majority, specifically, sixty-two schools, or eighty-one percent of the sample, included diagnostic-prescriptive services; fifty-seven (seventy-four percent) provided remedial education; another fifty-four, or seventy percent, made general academics available; while perceptual-motor training was included in the curricula of sixty-five percent of the sample, or fifty schools; another thirty-nine noted adaptive physcial education; and some twenty-five listed other components, including language by four schools, vocational education by three, sensory motor integration, art therapy, group process/psychotherapy, and functional academic survival skills, each by two schools; pre-vocational, social development, vision therapy, self-help skills, play therapy, right brain activities, structure of intellect training, fine arts, religion, play skills, drama, and motivational enrichment each were reported as single offerings by twelve schools.

Supportive Services

Results

In addition to specific curricular content, fifty-four respondents included speech therapy as a supportive service; some fifty-three provided on-site counseling services, while another twenty-seven made such services available on a contracted basis; physical therapy was noted by twenty-five schools, or thirty-three percent of the sample. Twenty-six schools offered "Other Services," including occupational therapy by ten schools, art therapy and adaptive physical education each by three of the sample, medical services by two schools, and music, music therapy, informal counseling, residential life living, biofeedback, vocational training, and parent therapy each as single offerings by seven respondents.

Discussion

While the above-noted services would seem to be impressive in scope, not all were available to all respondents. Some thirty-nine percent of the sample, or thirty schools, noted two of the supportive services available; sixteen members of the sample had access to three sources while thirteen had access to four; another twelve had only one supportive service available and one school reported five such sources at their disposal.

A review of the preceding data would seem to suggest that private special education schools, at least those included in this study, provide a broad spectrum of both curricular content and supportive services. The writer frequently has heard others make the observation that "For the money they charge, the private schools

should provide the best." While no value judgement is justified, it would seem apparent from the study's data that responding schools are maintaining a leadership role relative to the total educational process. Within the population studied, diagnostic-prescriptive approaches were the rule, not the exception, as was perceptual-motor training and adaptive physical education. One might respond that the sample population included only special education schools and such curricular implementation was mandated by the very nature of the population served. A logical rebuttal could be that such an approach might be beneficial for all students, special or otherwise, in either the private or public sectors. Because of its serving such large numbers, however, such a premise probably never could become a reality within the latter setting.

It was exciting, also, to note among the respondents' offerings such contemporary considerations as art therapy, structure of intellect training, motivational enrichment, and the particularly intriguing right brain activities. Again, such content must be viewed as efforts by the private special education schools studied to meet the unique needs of their students. Perhaps, the overall supportive services offered by reporting schools were not markedly different from those available within selected portions of the public sector. There were two unique exceptions, however; one school included biofeedback and another offered parent therapy. The writer found both to be provocative, wondering what degree of success was being enjoyed by the former and how the latter differed from traditional parent counseling.

While a variety of supportive services was reported in the study, the number of specific services available to each school was a bit discouraging. Slightly more than one out of every three schools had but two such services; an equal number had three or more; but twelve schools had merely one. It is suspected that financial considerations may have played a part in availability of these much-desired curricular adjuncts.

Sources and Types of Students Served

Sources of those students who received the curricular and supportive services of the population earlier studied reflected an interesting cross section of society.

Sources

Results

A significant majority of respondents, some seventy schools, or ninety-one percent of the sample, received students directly from the public sector; fifty-two schools (sixty-eight percent) accepted individuals from state agencies, i.e., welfare, etc.; fifty-five percent of the respondents, or forty-two in number, enrolled students from other private schools; another thirty-three, or forty-three percent of the sample, accepted referrals from the various court services; an almost identical number--thirty-two--noted students coming from other refferants, including private professionals by fifteen respondents; physicians by fourteen; parents and other clinics, one each by each of six schools; from former clients, five schools; and three members of the sample noted receiving students from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Types

Results

Learning Disabilities

A majority of reporting schools--some seventy-three percent, or fifty-six in number--noted providing services for students with moderately severe learning disabilities; a somewhat smaller group--fifty, or sixty-five percent of the sample--included programming for children with mildly severe learning disabilities; services for students with severe learning disabilities were provided by forty-five schools, or fifty-eight percent of the population studied.

Emotionally Disturbed

Some forty-three schools, or fifty-six percent of the sample, made, services available for students with moderately severe emotional disturbance; another thirty-eight included students diagnosed as having mildly severe emotional disturbance, while thirty-two schools provided programming for learners with severe emotional problems.

Mentally Handicapped

Children who were mildly, moderately, and severely mentally handicapped were accepted by twenty-two, eighteen, and twelve respondents respectively.

Other

Forty-six percent of the sample--some thirty-five schools--stated acceptance of students with varying combinations of handicapping conditions; and seventeen noted categories other than those specified in the survey, including communication handicaps, autism, physically handicapped, and severe hearing impaired, each reported by

each of three respondents; neurologically impaired and gifted learning disabled, each accepted by each of two schools; severe multiply handicapped, developmentally delayed infants, Downs Syndrome, and schizophrenia, each reported by each of two of the respondents.

Numbers of Students Enrolled

Total Number of Students Enrolled In Graded and Nongraded Schools

Results

Of the seventy-seven reporting schools, twenty-five--or thirty-two percent--had a total enrollment of less than twenty-five students; the next largest group--twenty-two schools, or twenty-nine percent of the sample--had a total student body of between five and fifty; this was followed by seventeen schools, or seventeen percent of the population studied, reporting an enrollment of fifty to seventy-five students. A population of from seventy-five to one hundred was noted by five respondents, or six percent of the sample; another three schools--or four percent of the sample--identified their total enrollments as being between one hundred and one hundred twenty-five children. This was followed by two respondents, or three percent of the population studied, having a student body of between one hundred twenty-five and one hundred fifty; a similar number reported having more than one hundred fifty students enrolled; and one school made no response to this item.

Discussion

The preceding data would seem to suggest that the average private special education school, as reflected within the population

studied, was relatively small, enrolling a maximum of seventy-five students. This should not be surprising when consideration is given to the philosophy upon which such a school is based, i.e., concentrated, individualized attention directed to a diagnosed handicap. Such a program could tend to lose its emphasis when services were attempted to be made available to the large numbers of children similar to those accepted by the public sector. Too, the private special education school frequently is characterized by a certain camaraderie, a close interaction between and among faculty, between and among students, between and among faculty and students. These interpersonal relationships are objectives not only desired, but actively encouraged by the school's administration and best are achieved when the population is not permitted to rise to an unwieldly number.

Number of Students by Grade Level Reported by Thirty-eight Schools

Results

Of the thirty-eight respondents who reported specific enrollments by grade level, the largest number of student--some three hundred fifty-five--was to be found at preschool; this was followed by ninth and tenth grades, each reflecting one hundred sixty-five enrollees; grade eight was next with one hundred fifty-eight, followed by sixth grade with one hundred forty-seven, grade seven with one hundred thirty-seven. Another one hundred thirty-five were enrolled at eleventh grade level, one hundred thirty-two at fifth, and one hundred twenty-two at first. Grade four reflected an enrollment of one hundred eighteen, with one hundred ten at third and one hundred

nine at twelfth. Kindergarten had ninety-five children enrolled and another seventy-four were identified as second graders.

The remaining thirty-nine respondents reported numbers of students at grade level by range, i.e., between fifty--seventy-five students in first grade.

Discussion

Of the thirty-eight respondents who reported specific numbers of students enrolled at each grade level, eleven hundred fifty-three children--or a significant majority of the two thousand twenty-two reported--were to be found between preschool and sixth grade levels. Of this number, three hundred fifty-five children were identified as preschoolers and another ninety-five as kindergarten enrollees. These results are not clear to the writer and raise a provocative question. All respondents in the sample were private, special education schools. Is this type of facility finding that many two and one-half to five year-olds who are at "high risk?" Perhaps so, when one considers the Law again. It does mandate an identification of all handicapped children and Operation Childfind is the process created for such a purpose. Perhaps the findings noted above reflect the success of Childfind and the placement of these youngsters within the private, special education setting since the public sector traditionally has not provided programming for this age range.

When students through five years of age were removed from the results, the preponderance of enrollments was found to be at the junior-senior high school levels. This is as might be expected, perhaps. It is suspected that parental concern for the well-being

of their child increases as the child approaches adolescence. When their suspicions become confirmed that the public sector cannot successfully prepare their son or daughter for productive adulthood, they turn that responsibility over to the smaller, more individualized private, special education school.

Too, it would be interesting to know how many of the children identified by grade level were diagnosed as severely handicapped. If a significant number carried such a classification, this could lend credence to an earlier observation, namely, that it was more convenient for the public sector to use funds from P.L. 94-142 to cover tuition fees for its severely handicapped students in private special education schools than to implement such programs themselves.

Numbers of Different Handicapping Conditions Served

Results

Some four different handicapping conditions were reflected by sixteen schools; a somewhat smaller number--fourteen--reported including three different handicapping conditions among their student population; twelve respondents noted seven different handicapping conditions reflected among their children, while another nine declared six conditions; six schools reported five and two different handicapping conditions, respectively, while another five noted eight and one, respectively; three schools identified nine conditions and one respondent stated their school's population reflected ten different handicapping states.

Discussion

It was no genuine surprise to the writer to note that the pub-

lic sector was a source of referral for seventy of the seventy-seven schools involved in the study. With monies from Public Law 94-142 available to them it was understandable that school districts might use those funds to cover tuition fees in a special education private school rather than assume the financial burden for developing such costly programs themselves. State agencies also apparently found it less expensive to refer handicapped children to special private schools than to finance the needed services on-site.

Referrals from other private schools probably reflected referrants' attempts to meet the needs of their particular students, i.e., since they did not, or could not, provide the services appropriate to a child's handicap, (s)he was referred to another private school where the services were available.

That thirty-three respondents accepted referrals from the courts was particularly understandable to the writer. When children have found themselves in that type of trouble within the public sector which ultimately necessitated a court appearance, the courts would seem to mete out drastic sentences only after other alternatives have been explored. The private special education school has been one of those alternatives.

Too, that referrals originated with the medical and other professions is another apparent indication of the interdisciplinary respect held for the quality of programming afforded by private special education schools, at least those included in this study.

Relative to the types of children served in special education, recent trends within the public sector have produced significantly

larger numbers of learning disabled students in American classrooms than in the past. Support for this observation is available by merely reviewing any state education agency (SEA) plan for handicapped children covering fiscal year 1970-71 and the same state's plan for 1980-81.

Respondents to this study's Survey noted a similar patterning. A significant majority of students accepted by the reporting schools were identified as learning disabled, or either a moderately severe or severe nature. These findings, in turn, supported an earlier observation, i.e., that perhaps it was more feasible for the public sector to use its P.L. 94-142 funds to pay private special education schools to provide services to children with severe and moderately severe learning disabilities than to initiate and support such services themselves.

That an equally large number of children identified as having severe or moderately severe emotional distrurbance was not noted by the respondents might have been due to a cost factor. Such handicaps frequently necessitate costly ancillary services, i.e., psychiatric, and usually available on a "crisis" basis, or when needed. Earlier reported data noted only one school in the total sample as having a fulltime psychiatrist and one other respondent having three or more, while only twenty-six staffed from one to three or more such positions on a parttime basis. It is apparent that such numbers of personnel could not be expected to adequately meet the needs of large populations of children with severe or moderately severe emotional distrubance.

Too, as the degree of severity increased, the number of schools accepting the mentally handicapped decreased. Again, a cost factor probably is influencing admission policies. Needs of the retarded are unique; specially trained personnel and materials are required; successful co-mingling, for purposes of learning, is not easy. Such settings demand a high degree of specialization; and such specialization can be very expensive.

A similar consideration to cost must be reflected when any of the less common handicaps are served, i.e., autism, developmentally delayed infants, etc. It is perhaps for this reason that such a small number of these children was noted among populations of the schools studied.

The Composite School

When all of the precdeding data were synthesized, it was possible to envision a kind of "average" or composite school.

Setting

The study's "average" school was non-church affiliated, located in a community having a population greater than 250,000, on a single campus, and occupied a single facility.

Governance

State licensed, the composite school was non-profit in nature, governed by a volunteer Board of Directors which, in turn, employed a fulltime executive director who also served as principal. No full-time business manager or accountant, per se, was employed.

Support Personnel

The composite school employed no fulltime or parttime personnel in the positions of psychologist, psychiatrist, physician, or nurse, though a rather wide variety of other services was available.

Faculty

The study's average setting reflected a faculty of from one to eight members, all certified in special education, with sixty percent also credentialed in elementary education and with secondary education endorsements held by twenty-five percent of the faculty. No interns were noted on the staff but from one to eight paraprofessionals were employed.

When all adults were considered, the adult:student ratio was 1:4; when only certificated personnel were counted, the ratio was 1:6/9.

Funding

Primary funding sources for this composite school were tuition fees and local education agencies (public school districts). Monies from private foundations, auxiliaries, and diagnostic services reflected secondary sources.

Generally, this average school had access to four different funding sources, with monies generated by P.L. 94-142 accounting for some forty percent of all tuition fees. Parents provided another forty percent and other sources, including scholarships, contributed the remaining funds.

Tuition fees established by this composite school were in excess of $200 per month, on a ten month schedule. Whatever scholar-

ship awards were made were in excess of $1500.

With the preceding funding patterns in place, the study's average school operated with a balanced budget.

Curriculum

Curricular offerings by the study's composite school were broad: primary emphasis was upon diagnostic-prescriptive strategies, closely followed by remedial interventions and general academics; also stressed were perceptual-motor training and adaptive physical education.

Supportive services were available in the areas of speech therapy and counseling.

Students

The public sector and state agencies provided the majority of students to the study's average school, with others being received from other private settings.

While four different handicapping conditions were reflected within the population of this composite school, the greatest number of students were identified as learning disabled, closely followed by those diagnosed as emotionally disturbed. All levels of severity were in evidence.

Enrollments

Finally, the composite school was relatively small, enrolling a maximum of seventy-five students. Because of the style of reporting data, it was impossible to determine specific numbers of students at each grade level.

Public Law 94-142

The question now addressed was, "Since its passage in 1975, what impact did Public Law 94-142 have upon the enrollment patterns of the schools included in this study?"

Impact Upon Enrollment

Increase or Decrease

Results

Only twenty-six of the seventy-seven schools studied noted absolutely no effects of P.L. 94-142 upon their enrollment. Of the thirty-eight who declared a definite increase in enrollments as a result of the Law, this increase was between five and ten percent for eighteen of the schools, between ten and fifteen percent for another nine schools, between fifteen and twenty-five percent for seven respondents and a twenty-five percent increase for four schools. No response to this question was made by thirteen institutions, or approximately seventeen percent of the sample population.

Sex Ratio

Results

Again it is fascinating to note that, for all schools reporting increased enrollments as a result of P.L. 94-142, four schools identified the proportion of student population increase as male at between twenty to forty percent; another thirteen schools put the percentage of increase among males at between forty and sixty, while a majority of respondents--twenty-one--stated the increase to be in excess of sixty percent.

Discussion

Such findings are compatible with what is known about handicapping conditions and their incidence among males and females. Without exception it is the former who most frequently are reflected in statistics relative to being poor readers, having difficulty with spelling, math, motor synthesis, being behavior problems within both the classroom and the broader social setting, having emotional problems, and more frequently being mentally handicapped.

Passage of P.L. 94-142 apparently made monies available to the public sector, permitting it the alternatives either of attempting to establish more effective programs within existing structures--a time consuming and expensive undertaking--or tuitioning the special student, more frequestly a male, into the private sector.

One must also speculate about the role of parental decision. Did parents of underachieving and/or acting-out males reflect a kind of frustration with the public sector and, recognizing the mandates of the Law, insist that a potentially more successful environment be tried?

Specific Handicapping Conditions

If the public sector chose to tuition out fairly large numbers of its handicapped students--or if the student enrollments in the private sector were decisions reflecting parental dissatisfaction with public school programming--what degree of severity was reflected in the disabilities of the children being received by the private special education schools included in this study? Was the private special education school primarily being given severe types with whom

the public sector was unable to cope.

Results

Relative to learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, and the mentally handicapped, data reported by the study's seventy-seven schools suggest that, indeed, the private sector was receiving students with severe handicaps.

Learning Disabilities

Specific to learning disabilities, seventeen schools--or twenty-two percent of all respondents--noted accepting the severe type; thirteen schools, or seventeen percent of the sample, reported accepting the moderately severe; and only six schools--or eight percent--noted accepting those with mildly severe learning disabilities.

Emotionally Disturbed

When data relative to the emotionally disturbed were reviewed, a similar pattern emerged. Some nineteen schools--or one out of every four--noted the severe category to be predominate; this was followed again by the moderately severe child, reported by eighteen percent of all respondents, in some fourteen schools; finally, nine schools, or twelve percent of the sample, stated that children with midly severe emotional disturbance were reflected in their population increase due to passage of P.L. 94-142.

Mentally Handicapped

While the same pattern was present when the mentally handicapped were studied, it is interesting to note how the numbers have changed. Five schools, or six percent of all respondents, noted an

increase composed of children identified as having moderately severe retardation; a yet smaller number--only two schools, or three percent of the sample--reported an increase in enrollments due to accepting those with mildly severe mental handicaps. (NOTE: Impact of the severely mentally handicapped upon increased enrollments as a result of P.L. 94-142 is not known. This category inadvertently was not included in Item E, Question three, Part II on The Survey. Following discussion with directors of four private special education schools, however, it is the writer's opinion that the severely mentally handicapped would reflect the least impact upon increased enrollments and was accepted by the least number of schools.)

Other Categories

Moving away from the three most frequently found categories of handicapping conditions, fourteen percent of the respondents--or twelve schools--noted an increase in enrollments due to their accepting children with varying combinations of learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, and/or mental handicaps. Another eight percent, or six respondents, noted increases in enrollment because of accepting other categories; included were two schools who accepted children with exclusively diagnosed behavior problems not in association with emotional disturbance or other primary diagnoses, another two who accepted multiply handicapped students, and one respondent each who noted an increase in enrollments because of their accepting the autistic, physically handicapped, and profoundly mentally handicapped, respectively.

Discussion

The preceding data would seem to lend credence to the premise that it is the more seriously handicapped child who is being received from the public sector into the private special education school, at least that school reflected in this study. While it is "armchair" conjecture, the writer continues to believe that such a practice is: 1) The result of expedience on the part of the public sector; 2) A reflection of growing dissatisfaction on the part of the parents of handicapped children relative to the quality of programming available for their child within the public sector; and 3) A growing recognition of the private special education school's ability to provide that kind of environment conducive to development of the total child.

Impact Upon Financial Status

With the influx of additional students, it could be surmised that the private special education school might experience some financial difficulties.

Negative Impact

Results

Relative to the schools reflected in this study, data support such an hypothesis, with approximately one out of every three reporting institutions noting difficulties directly attributable to P.L. 94-142.

Of the twenty-seven schools citing problems, fifty-six percent--or fifteen respondents--noted satisfactory resolution; another forty-one percent--or eleven schools--reported no satisfactory reso-

lution to the problems and one school failed to respond.

Resolution

When a satisfactory resolution to their financial needs was achieved, fifteen schools--or fifty-six percent of the group--relied upon increasing tuition and fees; another nineteen percent--or five schools--turned to addition public subscription; four schools, or fifteen percent of the group, went to deficit spending; and one school, reflecting four percent of the group, resorted to a "tapping" of investments. Within the "Other" category, two schools identified fund raising (apparently above and beyond the category "Additional Public Subscription," suggesting that fund raising was, to these respondents, an innovative undertaking), one school reduced the number of staff hours and, consequently, its cash outflow, and another school was forced to rely upon the owner's "kick-in."

For those schools who yet had to arrive at a resolution of their financial problems encountered as a result of enactment of the Law, fifteen, or thirty-two percent of the respondents, planned to increase tuition and fees; another seventeen percent, or eight schools, noted resorting to additional public subscription; six schools responding to this question, or thirteen percent of the total respondents, planned deficit spending and one--or two percent of all respondents to this item--stated they would have to resort to a "tapping" of investments. Five schools (eleven percent of all respondents to this question) noted "Other" resources including fund raising by two schools; private donations, grant applications, and "tapping" more directly into P.L. 94-142, each by one school respectively.

Discussion

Here, again, can be seen the pattern of financial survival so typical of the private sector. The first avenue to be explored when funds are needed is that of increasing tuitions and related fees, followed by turning with greater intensity to public subscription. Thus the private special education schools, at least those reflected in this study, do not differ markedly from the regular private schools insofar as approaching financial matters in concerned.

Impact Upon School Control

Just as P.L. 94-142 appears to have had an impact upon the financial structure of many of the schools included in this study, data suggest it also has had an effect upon the reporting schools' freedoms, ability to maintain singular control over their policies, procedures, curricular content and implementation.

Policies, Procedures, Curricular Content and Implementation Results

Approximately one out of every three respondents reported reduction in their freedoms relative to ability to maintain singular control over their policies, procedures, curricular content and implementation. Yet a definite majority--forty-one schools or fifty-three percent of the sample went on record as favoring the receipt of continued direct financial support from the federal government.

Discussion

Such a finding rather strongly suggests that availability of monies probably is worth, or perhaps even more important than, any constraints attendant upon it.

Impact Upon School Staff

Staff Understanding and Acceptance of P.L. 94-142

Because of its complexity, P.L. 94-142 could tend to be rejected by both instructional and administration staff.

Instructional

Results

Instructional staff relative to thirty-seven schools, or forty-eight percent of the sample, noted their understanding of the Law to be very good; another thirty-five percent, or twenty-seven schools, said the faculty's understanding was adequate; eleven respondents, or fourteen percent of the population studied, admitted to the need for additional inservicing; and two schools provided no response.

Again focusing exclusively upon instructional staff and its level of acceptance of P.L. 94-142, twenty-two respondents, or twenty-eight percent of the sample, noted an enthusiastic level; forty-three percent, or thirty-three schools, recorded a "fairly positive" acceptance; thirteen responses, or seventeen percent of the group studied, noted the faculty as neutral; another nine percent, or seven schools, voiced some reluctance about the legislation; two schools failed to respond; and no respondent identified their instructional staff as being very reluctant to accept P.L. 94-142.

Discussion

Such data as these would seem to suggest that the private special education schools included in this study have, for the most part, done an excellent job of positively presenting P.L. 94-142 to

their faculties. Not only was there good understanding and general acceptance but both were at a relatively high level. That only fourteen percent of all schools studied felt the need for inservicing would seem to lend additional positivism to what apparently has been a successful effort to train personnel relative to the intricacies of the Law. That thirteen schools reported their faculties to be neutral where acceptance of P.L. 94-142 was concerned probably emphasizes an already recognized reality within the public sector, that, indeed, additional inservicing would be beneficial.

Administrative

When both variables of understanding and accepting P.L. 94-142 were studied relative to school administration, a somewhat different pattern emerged.

Results

Approximately two out of every three respondents noted administrative understanding to be very good, a figure significantly higher than that reflecting instructional staff; twenty-two percent of the sample, or seventeen schools, noted it to be adequate; nine respondents, or twelve percent of the sample, believed additional inservicing would be beneficial; and again two schools did not respond.

Virtually the same number of schools felt administrative acceptance of the Law was enthusiastic as was that of the faculty. Patterns relative to fairly positive, neutral, and some reluctance levels of acceptance also were virtually identical between administrative and instructional personnel. Our school, however, did note

its former group to be accepting the Law "very reluctantly."

Discussion

From all of these informations, one major premise would seem to be warranted insofar as the private special education schools included in this study were concerned; relative to P.L. 94-142, attitudes related to understanding and accepting the Law probably were initially reflected and modeled by a school's administration and then, for the most part, were mirrored by that school's instructional staff.

Impact Upon Future Operations

Once the current impact of P.L. 94-142 upon financial matters and the instructional-administration of personnel of private special education schools included in this study was reviewed, it became necessary to study other considerations, both contemporary and projected, potentially influenced by the Law.

Need for Additional Facilities

Results

Some twenty-one schools, or twenty-seven percent of the total sample, noted an immediate need for additions to their physical plants; forty-seven respondents--some sixty-one percent of the population studied--noted present facilities to be adequate and nine schools failed to respond.

Discussion

The writer found these results somewhat surprising; discussion with numerous administrators over the past five years almost in-

variably led to an expression of near critical need for additional space--and as quickly as possible.

Establishment of a Waiting List

While P.L. 94-142 prohibits placing children in the public sector on a waiting list, since the Law may or may not be adopted by the private special education school, and since large numbers of children appear to be entering the private special education setting, it could be surmised that most schools included in this study were having to resort to placing children on waiting lists until space become available. Such was not the reality.

Results

Twenty respondents, or slightly less than one of every four schools--noted creation of waiting lists; nine schools did not respond.

Discussion

That almost one out of every four schools included in this study did have to delay entry of a handicapped child into a potentially meaningful program cannot be disregarded as meaningless. Reasons underlying the establishment of such waiting lists well may resolve around physical plant problems, however, since virtually the same number of respondents cited an immediate need for additional facilities as did those noting a waiting list for admission.

Early Return to the Public Sector

Results

Approximately one out of every three schools in the total population studied reported returning students to the public sector

before faculties felt they were ready; slightly more than half of the respondents noted such a practice was not in effect within their schools; and nine schools in the study--or twelve percent of the total--made no response.

Discussion

While no supporting data were available, it is suspected that schools returning students to the public sector did so with a certain reluctance. The writer's ten years of experience in the private sector suggests that one of at least two factors usually is operational when such practices are implemented: 1) Cost to the parents of maintaining their child in a private school; and 2) the believe that private schools are too "sheltered" or "protective," "not realistic" in terms of the environmental demands placed upon the students.

The preceding would have been relevant prior to passage of P.L. 94-142. With the advent of the Law, however, and with its well-defined mandates relative to their rights, parents have been turning with increasing aggressiveness to the public sector, demanding that free appropriate education decreed by the federal legislation. As a result, and because of parental education relative to the Law, more and more children--at least as suggested by results of this study--would seem to be returning to the public schools and participating in that special education program, even though the private special education setting might believe such action was premature.

Increased Cooperation with Other Agencies, Current

As P.L. 94-142 impacted with greater force upon the public sector, and as increased numbers of childred transferred from that

setting to the private special education school, it could be hyothesized that the latter institution would find itself becoming more and more involved with other agencies. Such a position was supported by results of this study.

Results

Of the seventy-seven schools surveyed, fifty-one--or sixty-six percent of the sample--reported an increased cooperation with other agencies, as a direct or indirect result of P.L. 94-142; another twenty-five percent, or nineteen schools, noted no such significant increase; and seven schools made no response.

Discussion

That two out of every three of the population studied noted increased cooperation with other agencies is readily understandable when one considers that a comprehensive history of each child must be available to the private special education school if it is going to program effectively for the student. Obtaining and correctly interpreting such a history requires dialog with referring and involved agencies, be they schools, court services, or public agencies, i.e., welfare, etc. Too, the private special education school is finding itself called upon with increased frequency by parent organizations, advocacy groups, and other units at virtually all levels, not merely local, to provide input relative to what services are, or should be, available to the exceptional child and his/her family. The writer views this as a professionally healthy trend.

Increased Interaction With Other Agencies, Future

Results

Forty-eight schools included in this study noted an expectancy for significantly greater interaction with parents in the future; an almost equal number--forty-six, or fifty-nine percent of the sample--voiced a similar expectancy relative to advocacy groups. Relative to both variables, exactly the same number--twenty-three schools, or thirty percent of the population--noted not expecting any increase of involvement; no response were recorded by six and eight schools respectively.

Discussion

Again, that a majority of schools surveyed indicated their being increasingly involved with parents and advocates as a result of P.L. 94-142 should not be surprising. With funding made available from the federal government, state and local education agencies have conducted aggressive and comprehensive programs to inform parents of their rights and the rights of their children as identified within the Law. Parents, in turn, have requested--and received--increased interaction with educational institutions, be they public or private. In short, parents of exceptional children would seem to be taking a much more active role in determining effectively of the programs made available to their youngsters.

As parents have gone about such determination, they frequently have encountered complex situations not understood by them. Seeking assistance, they have turned to others more learned than they in the intricacies of P.L. 94-142. These individuals--these advocates--in

turn, have achieved a high level or respect withing the professional community, due, in part, again to federal monies available for development of programs deliberately designed to provide training for such individuals and groups. Thus, as the respondents in this study seem to indicate, greater interaction with parents can be expected in the future and with those individuals and groups trained to represent them and their children.

Change in Existing Philosophy

Results

While a majority of respondents in this study suggested at least mild changes in the present status quo of their schools as a result of P.L. 94-142, three out of every four respondents said they expected no change in the philosophy currently prevailing in their schools. Only eight respondents, or approximately ten percent of the sample, noted that a change probably would take place; and ten schools did not respond to the question.

Discussion

Even in the presence of increased enrollments, increased costs, and greater emphasis upon the more severe and limiting disabilities, it is heartening to observe that a majority of the private special education schools included in this study does not plan to alter its basic philosophy relative to education and exceptional children. Such a commitment is not viewed as a kind of rigidity and dedication to the past; rather, it is seen as another indication of confidence in a demonstrated ability to provide the best possible learning environment for the special child.

One is permitted to merely speculate about the factors motivating a change of philosophy on the part of eight of the respondents: 1) Perhaps increased enrollments and costs necessitated an adult:student ratio larger than hope for; 2) Perhaps inclusion of more severe types of disabling conditions forced addition of curricular elements not foreseen earlier; or 3) Perhaps, with the increase in numbers of students, staff, and curricular, what was planned as a small, somewhat personally accented learning setting had to give way to a larger, more impersonal environment.

The writer suspects that all of the preceding probably contributed in varying degrees of importance.

Overview of Impact of P.L. 94-142.

Just as an "average" school was discernible when earlier data were reviewed, it now is possible to identify a kind of "common" or average impact of Public Law 94-142 upon the seventy-seven respondents included in this study.

The Law definitely had an impact, generally resulting in an increase of between five and ten percent in enrollments, with better than sixty percent of that increase reflecting male students. Among the increase, the greatest rise embraced the severe level of learning disabilities and emotional disturbance.

Relative to its impact upon schools' financial status, P.L. 94-142 generally has not resulted in problems; when it did, however, these problems were resolved in a satisfactory manner. Resolution essentially was achieved by an increase in tuition and other fees.

Relative to control over policies, procedures, curricular content and its implementation, the Law has resulted in no reduction of freedom and there appears to be a general willingness to continue receiving direct financial support from the federal government.

Insofar as its understanding and acceptance of P.L. 94-142 were reflected by involved faculty, the former would seem to be very good and the latter fairly positive. Similar attitudes were apparent among administrators.

Overall, the Law appears to have motivated a need for additional facilities, to establish waiting lists for admission of students, to return students to the public sector before they probably were adequately prepared, and to bring about increased cooperation with other agencies, parents and specific groups such as advocates. Despite all of these changes, however, no significant change in prevailing philosophies was anticipated.

Summary

Chapter IV has included a review of data, a discussion of the relevancy of findings, a presentation of the study's "average" school and a composite impact of P.L. 94-142 upon that school.

Chapter V will present results of the three personal interviews conducted to gain in-depth insights into the impact of the Law upon specific private special education schools.

CHAPTER V

THE INTERVIEWS

DISCUSSION

To gain additional insights into the possible impact of P.L. 94-142 upon specific private special education schools, personal interviews were carried out by the writer with three nationally recognized educators, each of them the founder-director of the private special education school.

Concerning their philosophies relative to acceptance of federal funds, Paul Knott of the Denver Academy differed from his co-professionals, Ron Spector, Director of Beverly Center in Los Angeles, California, and Newcombe Rice, Director of Brush Ranch School in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Knott had never received so called "third paty" funding and was reluctant to consider it in the future. Both Rice and Spector noted receiving such monies, having a certain dependency upon these funds, and projecting plans based upon continuation of such receipts.

It was Knott's position that such funding was precarious, that it could be withdrawn at any time, that--on such a basis--a school cound not be built.

A somewhat different positon was taken, however, by Spector, who expressed a well-stated optimism relative to the federal law and congressional support for it.

While Rice was not nearly as positive about the stability of P.L. 94-142, he was in agreement with Knott in noting that continued

funding in the future probably would continue to have significant impact upon the private special education sector.

Neither Rice nor Knott observed difficulties with actual receipt of federal monies since both had established will-defined procedures within their respective accounting systems for the processing of such funds.

Relative to the possible deregulation, or repeal of the Law, Knott and his Denver Academy would not expect any serious consequences since the institution presently operates independently of such subsidizing.

"The changes that have been made will continue," was Spector's position relative to the future of the Law, while Rice opined that a reduction in, or elimination of, presently received federal monies would result in a reduction in numbers of children served and services available.

Both Brush Ranch School and the Denver Academy held membership in the National Association of Private Special Education Schools but the director of neither school felt this organization was addressing its membership's potential problems, should the Law be significantly revised or even repealed in future months.

Because the State Department of Education in Colorado affords a high degree of latitude to its private schools, and because the Denver Academy received no funds from P.L. 94-142, the question of what constituted the least restrictive environment for a child was of minimal concern. Likewise, for Spector's Beverly Center, the question was of no frequent concern, essentially because California's

legislature has mandated special education, has committed itself to quality programs, and includes the private sector in its funding pattern.

This, in turn, encourages cooperation between the public and private sectors and reduces the possible attrition that might arise over which setting can provide the least restrictive environment.

Brush Ranch School's director did note some problems, however, when this question was raised and observed that"...you can usually prove that the environment where the children have been previously was not conducive to their learning; therefore this one---the private school---is not restrictive."

All of the interviewees identified a kind of common evaluation battery, not so much, apparently, to be in accordance with P.L. 94-142's mandates, but essentially because the selected instruments provided them with data pertinent to a child's learning. Both Denver Academy and Beverly Center carried out on-site testing but Brush Ranch's director was most emphatic in noting "We do not do diagnosis. We have that done by someone else."

While Spector, Knott, and Rice all indicated their schools had used a modified individualized education program well in advance of enactment of the Law, only Rice noted that his school now has adopted the format used by the state.

None of the three gentlemen related experiencing difficulties with the transfer of students to and from the public sector. One specific theme, however, was repeated almost verbatim by Rice and Spector: As a result of P.L. 94-142, their schools were receiving

more severely handicapped students than had been envisioned when the facilities were planned.

Summary

In summary, three directors of private special education schools were interviewed by the writer relative to the impact of P.L. 92-142 upon their respective institutions.

One individual noted no impact because his school received no funds from that source. The remaining two respondents observed receipt of increased numbers of students identified as severely handicapped. One of the three interviewees was optimistic about the future of the Law and its influence upon the private special education school; one was quite negative about the Law's stability; and the third respondent admitted to an uncertainty but expected continued impact.

All three schools had forms of an individualized education program in place prior to enactment of the Law and only one subsequently altered his format to conform to state standards.

No problems were noted relative to transfer of students to and from the public sector.

Chapter VI will address a summary of the study.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, WEAKNESSES, AND HEURISTIC QUALITIES OF THE STUDY

Summary

Legislation passed by the Congress of the United States in 1975 presumed that the worth of all human beings was the same and that the legal rights of the handicapped were intact.

Since enactment of Public Law 94-142, increased numbers of exceptional children have found their way to the private special education school in search of that education promised under P.L. 94-142.

If the private special education school is to meet its responsibilities to children, then questions relative to philosophy, physical plant, fiscal accountability, and staff qualification must be addressed.

It was to such objectives that this study was directed.

Some seventy-seven private special education schools in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming responded to a questionnaire prepared by the Examiner. Included were such questions as:

1.0 What is the composition of the selected school, i.e., campus of one building or more, structure of governing body, nature of funding, etc.

2.0 In the years following its passage, has the Law resulted in an increased enrollment among those private, special education schools selected for the study?

2.1 If so, how great has been that increase?
2.2 What type of student characterized that increase?

2.3 From where does (s)he come?

3.0 If an increase in enrollments has been experienced, and if the school's population now reflects a broader range of handicapping conditions, has there been any change in the philosophy upon which the institution was founded?

4.0 If an increase in enrollments has been experienced, and if the school's population now reflects a broader range of handicapping conditions, has there been any change in the institution's fiscal accountability?

5.0 What was, and presently is, the level of understanding and acceptance of P.L. 94-142 by the institution's administration and instructional staff?

6.0 What new demands have been placed upon the school as a direct result of accepting more students covered by the mandates of P.L. 94-142?

7.0 What is the institution's position relative to increased future involvement with the federal government? and

8.0 What problems are perceived for the future if there is to be continued adherance to P.L. 94-142.

Results were processed through the Computer Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, then translated into tabular form by E.

Findings suggested that the study's "average" or composite private special education school was non-church affiliated, was located in a community having a population greater than 250,000, and was located on a single campus, occupying a single facility.

The school was state licensed, non-profit, governed by a volunteer Board of Directors which, in turn, employed a fulltime executive director who also served as principal. No fulltime business manager or accountant, per se, was employed; neither were a fulltime psychologist, psychiatrist, physician, or nurse on fulltime status, though a side variety of other services where available.

This average school had a faculty of from one to eight, all

certified in special education, and from one to eight paraprofessionals, serving a maximum of seventy-five students. This resulted in an adult:student ratio of approximately 1:4, a certified adult:student ratio of approximately 1:6/9.

Primary sources of funding for this average school were tuition fees and monies received from local public school districts.

Some four sources of funding were available, with monies from P.L. 94-142 accounting for forty percent, followed by tuition fees, parents, and auxiliary assistance. Tuition charges were in excess of $200 per month, on a ten-month basis. This average school operated with a balanced budget.

Curricular content emphasized diagnostic-prescriptive approaches, followed by remedial strategies, general academic, perceptual-motor training, and adaptive physical education. Speech therapy and counseling were the primary supportive services provided.

This average school received a majority of its students from the public sector and state agencies. A significant number of these individual was identified as learning disabled, predominately male, and reflecting moderately severe, mildly severe, and severe levels respectively. This classification was followed by the emotionally disturbed and mentally handicapped, each in corresponding pattern of severity but with significantly fewer of the latter classification being reflected in the school's total population.

Relative to the impact of P.L. 94-142 upon this composite school, it generally has resulted in an increase of enrollment of be-

tween five and ten percent, with more than sixty percent of that increase reflecting male students. The majority of this increase has been in the specific areas of severe learning disabilities and severe emotional disturbance.

Generally, the Law has not resulted in significant financial stress upon the schools studies; when it did, the problems were resolved by an increase in tuitions and other fees.

Relative to reduction of freedom specific to policies and curricula, none of a significant note was observed and a general willingness to continue receipt of federal monies was evident.

Attitudes relative to understanding and accepting P.L. 94-142 were equally high among instructional and administrative staff.

The Law would seem to have created among the schools studied: 1) a need for additional facilities; 2) establishment of waiting lists for entry into school; 3) returning students to the public sector before the staff felt they were adequately prepared; 4) an increased cooperation with various community agencies, especially those involved with advocacy, and 5) despite the preceding, no change in the basic philosophy governing operations of the learning site.

Weaknesses of the Study

Certain weaknesses in the study were evident:

1) Items on The Survey apparently did not provide the respondent ample flexibility relative to certain content, i.e., budget analyses, sources of scholarship funding, means for attaining fiscal accountability, specific numbers of students registered into identified grade levels, and analysis of total staff structure.

Heuristic Qualities of the Study

It would be of interest now to chronicle a comprehensive history of the evolution of private special education schools in America; similarly, it might be of worth to determine if such a movement is underway in other countries and, if so, to compare and contrast these developments.

Too, the writer would like answers to such questions as: "Will the move toward a national association of private special education schools be successful?" or "How do regulatory guidelines relative to the private special education school agree with and/or differ between and among, the various states? Are there regional similarities? Are there significant differences? If so, why?" or "Relative to curriculum, is there a common thread woven among the various private special education schools in a given state or region? Are these schools in a given region influenced by a common theoretical approach and/or philosophy?" or "If this study were repeated in three years, would the results be similar? If not, what factors might have intervened to bring about change? Are these factors regional or national?"

Postscript

Since this study was initiated, a new administration sits in Washington. Its approach to education, specifically education of the handicapped, would appear to differ from that of the preceding administration.

There are strong indications that P.L. 94-142 will be sharply amended, if not entirely repealed; the Department of Education--along

with the Office of Special Education--may be dismantled and restructured as a private foundation; funding for the handicapped may be in the form of "block grants" to each state, with programs for exceptional children competing with numerous other programs for funding.

Should the preceding become reality, and should programming for the handicapped within the public sector demonstrate an insensitivity to the needs of special children--an insensitivity motivated by a lack of dollars--then the private sector must ready itself for a renewed insurgence of children, a renewed plea for assistance from parents, and a renewed demand for excellence and leadership from the general public.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A REVIEW OF SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973: A REVIEW*

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 has more power than any other piece of legislation to help bring handicapped people into the mainstream of national life. It has been called the Civil Rights Law for the Handicapped. Fully enforced, it can eliminate discrimination against disabled children and adults in education, employment, housing, health services, recreation--and every other area that citizens normally take for granted.

In its original form, Section 504 is a brief but all-encompassing provision of the Rehabilitation Act, stating that: "no otherwise qualified individual shall solely by reason of his handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Regulations cover agencies receiving funds from federal departments other than just HEW.

Section 504 underscores the right of all handicapped children to a free and appropriate education regardless of the nature or severity of the handicap. In many important ways, the provisions are similar to the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142). For example:

- School systems must undertake "child-find" programs every year--to identify and locate unserved handicapped children;
- Handicapped children must not be segregated, but must be educated in regular classrooms to the greatest possible extent and be included in all other school-related and extra-curricular activities;
- When a child is placed in a residential school in order to receive an appropriate program it must be at no cost to his or her parents;

- Evaluation and placement must be based on information drawn from many sources which can provide a comprehensive picture of needs; tests must be tailored to assess areas of educational need and not merely to produce an IQ score; and

- Due process safeguards must give parents an adequate opportunity to challenge and seek review of education decisions.

Colleges and Universities are Included

According to the regulations, colleges, universities, and post-secondary institutions such as area vocational technical institutes, training and skills schools may not discriminate against handicapped persons in recruitment, admission and treatment after admission. They are "required to make reasonable adjustments to permit handicapped persons to fulfull academic requirements."

Colleges are not required to lower academic standards or alter degree requirements but they may have to:

- Extend the time allowed to earn a degree or substitute one elective course for another;

- Modify teaching methods and examinations to allow for full participation in a degree program;

- Provide braille books or other aids if these are necessary; and

- Make classrooms accessible to all.

Discrimination is prohibited in all college-related activities, including health, counseling, athletics, social, housing, financial assistance, student employment and other programs receiving federal funds.

What About Employment?

The regulations include strong requirements protecting the rights of handicapped job-seekers. They require employers to make

"reasonable accommodations" to make it possible for a physically or mentally disabled employee to hold a job, including: making facilities accessible; acquiring, modifying, or redesigning equipment or devices; job restructuring; parttime or modified schedules; provision of readers or interpreters; and elimination of tests which "screen out" handicapped employees.

This is just a sketch of the requirements set down by Section 504. The regulations are simply and clearly written and should be familiar to all educators, parents of handicapped children, to disabled adults and to all advocates of civil rights for handicapped citizens.

*Excerpted from Turnbull and Turnbull (16:1ff).

APPENDIX B

THE PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL AND PUBLIC LAW 94-142

A SURVEY

Dear Administrator:

May I ask you, please, to take a few minutes and respond to the following questions. To maintain confidentiality, neither the name of your school nor of the respondent need be included. Should your wish a copy of the final results, however, please add your name and mailing address.

A stamped, addressed envelope is attached for your convenience. Your time and assistance are appreciated.

- -

THE PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL
AND
PUBLIC LAW 94-142

A SURVEY

I. GENERAL

School Type
( ) Church Affiliation
( ) Non-Church Affiliation

Setting
( ) Community less than 10,000 Population
( ) Population between 10,000 - 50,000
( ) Population between 50,000 - 100,000
( ) Population between 100,000 - 150,000
( ) Population greater than 250,000
( ) Single Campus
( ) Multi-Campus
( ) Single building facility
( ) Multi-building facilities

Affiliations and Accreditations
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Governance
( ) Profit Corporation
( ) Non-Profit Corporation
( ) Board of Directors
( ) Professional Advisory Board
( ) Other

Administration	Number Fulltime	Number Parttime	
	_____	_____	Executive Director
	_____	_____	Director(s)
	_____	_____	Assistant Director(s)
	_____	_____	Principal(s)
	_____	_____	Headmaster
	_____	_____	Business Manager
	_____	_____	Accountant
	_____	_____	Admissions Director
	_____	_____	Other _____

Supportive Personnel	Number Fulltime	Number Parttime	
	_____	_____	Psychologist(s)
	_____	_____	Psychiatrist(s)
	_____	_____	Physician
	_____	_____	Nurse(s)
	_____	_____	Other _____
			_____
			_____
			_____

Faculty

Total Number _____
Number Certified _____

Number Certified in
- Special Education _____
- Elementary Education _____
- Secondary Education _____
- Other _____ _____

Number of Interns _____
Number of Paraporfessionals _____

Certified Teacher: Pupil Ratio
- ( ) Less than 4:1
- ( ) 4:1 - 5:1
- ( ) 6:1 - 8:1
- ( ) 9:1 - 10:1
- ( ) Greater than 10:1

Adult:Pupil Ratio
- ( ) Less than 4:1
- ( ) 4:1 - 5:1
- ( ) 6:1 - 8:1
- ( ) 9:1 - 10:1
- ( ) Greater than 10:1

Funding Sources

( ) Tuition Fees
( ) Diagnostic - Evaluation Fees
( ) Consultative Fees
( ) Endowments
( ) Private Foundations
( ) Federal Grants
( ) State Grants
( ) Local School District Funding
( ) Auxiliary Fund Raising
( ) Other _____

Fiscal Budget "balanced":

( ) YES

( ) NO

If there is a fiscal deficit, this is resolved by:

( ) Endowment Funds
( ) Foundation Monies
( ) Auxiliary Monies
( ) Public Subscription
( ) Other _____

Tuition

( ) $ 50 - $100 Month, 10 Month Year
( ) $100 - $200 Month, 10 Month Year
( ) $200+ Month, 10 Month Year
( ) $ 50 - $100 Month, 12 Month Year
( ) $100 - $200 Month, 12 Month Year
( ) $200+ Month, 12 Month Year

Scholarships

Number available per school year

( ) 1 - 5
( ) 5 - 10
( ) 10+

Average value of each award

( ) $ 200 - $ 500
( ) $ 500 - $1,000
( ) $1,000 - $1,500
( ) $1,500+

Curricula

( ) General Academics
( ) Adaptive Physical Education
( ) Diagnostic-Prescriptive Strategies
( ) Remedial Education
( ) Perceptual-Motor Training
( ) Other _____

Supportive Services

( ) Counseling and Related Psychological Services on Site
( ) Counseling Contracted
( ) Speech Therapy
( ) Physical Therapy
( ) Other _____

Referral Sources

( ) Other Private Schools
( ) Public Schools
( ) Court Services
( ) State Agencies, i.e., Welfare, etc.
( ) Other _____

Types of Handicapping Conditions Accepted

( ) Mildly Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Moderately Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Mildly Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Moderately Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Mildly Severe Mental Retardation
( ) Moderately Severe Mental Retardation
( ) Severe Mental Retardation
( ) Combinations of the Preceding
( ) Other _____

Number of Students Enrolled

( ) Less than 25
( ) 25 - 50
( ) 50 - 75
( ) 75 - 100
( ) 100 - 125
( ) 125 - 150
( ) More than 150

Approximate Number of Students Enrolled at Each Grad Level

Pre-School	_____
Kindergarten	_____
Grade 1	_____
Grade 2	_____
Grade 3	_____
Grade 4	_____
Grade 5	_____
Grade 6	_____
Grade 7	_____
Grade 8	_____
Grade 9	_____
Grade 10	_____
Grade 11	_____
Grade 12	_____

II. PUBLIC LAW 94-142

1. Has enactment of P.L. 94-142 had any impact upon your school's enrollments?

( ) YES ( ) NO

2. If your answer to the preceding questions was "YES", has that effect resulted in an increase of enrollments?

( ) YES ( ) NO

3. A. If your answer to the preceding questions was "YES", the noted increase has been by approximately which of the following percentages this school year?

( ) 5 - 10%
( ) 10 - 15%
( ) 15 - 25%
( ) Greater than 25%

B. Of this percentage, what proportion would be males?

( ) 20 - 40%
( ) 40 - 60%
( ) Greater than 60%

C. Of the total student population, the percentage or number of tuition fees paid by the following:

P.L. 94-142	_____	_____
Scholarships	_____	_____
Parents	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____

D. The noted increase in enrollments reflects students coming primarily from which of the following agencies?

( ) Public Schools
( ) Other Private Schools
( ) Court Services
( ) Public Agencies, i.e., Welfare, etc.
( ) Other _____

E. The noted increase in enrollments would include students reflecting which of the following?

( ) Mildly Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Moderately Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Severe Learning Disabilities
( ) Mildly Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Moderately Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Severe Emotional Disturbance
( ) Mildly Severe Mental Retardation
( ) Moderately Severe Mental Retardation
( ) Combinations of the Preceding
( ) Other _____

4. As a result of the enactment of P.L. 94-142, has your school experienced additional financial problems?

( ) YES ( ) NO

A. If your response to the preceding was "YES", have these problems been resolved satisfactorily?

( ) YES ( ) NO

B. If your answer to the preceding questions was "YES", which of the following assisted in that resolution?

( ) Increased Tuition and Fees
( ) Additional Public Subscription
( ) "Tapping" of Investments
( ) Redirection of Endowment Funds
( ) Deficit Spending, i.e., Loans, etc.
( ) Other _____

C. If your answer to 4B was "NO", how do you propose to resolve the problems?

( ) Increased Tuition and Fees
( ) Additional Public Subscription
( ) "Tapping" of Investments
( ) Redirection of Endowment Funds
( ) Deficit Spending, i.e., Loans, etc.
( ) Other _____

5. As a result of the enactment of P.L. 94-142, do you believe the freedom of your school to maintain singular control over its policies, procedures, and curricular content and implementation has been (or is being) reduced?

( ) YES ( ) NO

6. As a result of the enactment of P.L. 94-142, would you be in favor of more direct financial support for private schools by the federal government?

( ) YES ( ) NO

7. How would you rate your faculty's <u>understanding</u> of P.L. 94-142 relative to its mandates?

( ) Enthusiastic
( ) Fairly Positive
( ) Neutral
( ) With Some Reluctance
( ) Very Reluctantly

9. How would you rate your administration's <u>understanding</u> of P.L. 94-142 relative to its mandates?

( ) Very Good
( ) Adequate
( ) Would Benefit from Additional Inservicing

10. How would you rate your administration's acceptance of P.L. 94-142 related to its mandates?

( ) Enthusiastic
( ) Fairly Positive
( ) Neutral
( ) With Some Reluctance
( ) Very Reluctantly

11. As a result of the enactment of P.L. 94-142, has your school:

Experienced a need for additional facilities?	( ) YES	( ) NO
Had to establish a waiting list of students wishing to enroll?	( ) YES	( ) NO
Found itself returning students to the publis setting before your faculty felt the students were ready?	( ) YES	( ) NO

12. As a result of the enactment of P.L. 94-142, do you project:

Increased cooperation with other agencies?	( ) YES	( ) NO
Increased interaction with Parents?	( ) YES	( ) NO
Increased involvement with particular groups i.e., advocacy, ACLD, ARC, etc?	( ) YES	( ) NO
A change in the philosophy which governed the school prior to the enactment of the law?	( ) YES	( ) NO

III. OTHER COMMENTS WHICH YOU FEEL WOULD BE OF HELP REGARDING THE P.L. 94-142 AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- -

Thank you! Please return the completed Survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope or to Mrs. Theresa C. Smith, Executive Director, New Horizons Center for Learning, 401 Campbell Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89107.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW FORMAT

INTERVIEW FORMAT

QUESTION: Relative to federal funding--particularly P.L. 94-142--and your school:

1. What has been your philosophy regarding seeking such funding?
2. What is your current philosophy regarding seeking such funding?
3. Do you anticipate any change in the future relative to this position?

QUESTION: From an administrative viewpoint, if you are receiving local, state, and/or federal support funds, what impact has this had on your school?

1. Do you encounter problems receiving the monies?
2. Do you anticipate problems of this nature in the future?

QUESTION: If you are not receiving local, state or federal funds, what monetary problems do you perceive for you and other private special education schools?

1. What solution do you suggest for resolution of these problems?

QUESTION: Suppose that P.L. 94-142 were significantly deregulated, or even repealed. What impact might this have upon the private special education school?

1. Do you work with the National Association of Private Special Schools to attempt resolution of such problems?

QUESTION: Relative to P.L. 94-142

1. Are you experiencing problems relative to the "lease restrictive" clause?
2. What evaluation procedure do you implement in your school?
3. Are individualized education programs prepared for all entering students?
4. Prior to enactment of the Law, did you prepare individualized education programs? If not, what approach was employed?
5. Are you experiencing problems relative to the transfer of students between your school and the public sector?

OTHER COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FROM EACH STATE INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FROM EACH STATE
INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

STATE	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Arizona	15
California	40
Colorado	2
Hawaii	1
Idaho	1
Montana	1
Nevada	1
New Mexico	1
Oregon	6
Utah	3
Washington	5
Wyoming	1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Academic Underachiever. 2nd edition. Boston, Massachusetts; Porter Sargent Publisher, 1970

2. Bersoff, D.N., and Veltman, E.S. "Public Law 94-142: Legal Implications for the Education of Handicapped Children," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12, No. 4 (Summer, 1979), 10-22.

3. Directory for Exceptional Children. 8th edition, 1978. Boston, Massachusetts: Porter Sargent Publisher, 1978.

4. Directory of Educational Facilities for the Learning Disabled. 8th edition, 1979-80. Novato, California: Academic Therapy, 1979.

5. Glover, J.A., and Gary, A.L. Mainstreaming Exceptional Children: How to Make It Work. Pacific Grove, California: Boxwood Press, 1976.

6. Handbook of Private Schools. 1979 edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Porter Sargent Publisher, 1979.

7. Harvey, J., and Siantz, J. "Public Education and the Handicapped," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12, no. 4 (Summer, 1979), 1-9.

8. Hoffman, E. "The American public school and the deviant child: The origin of their envolvement," Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9, 415-23.

9. Kauffman, J.M. Historical trends and contemporary issues in special education in the United States. In J.M. Kauffman and D.P. Hollahan (Eds.), Handbook of Special Education. Prentice Hall, 1981.

10. Kirk, S.A. Educating Exception Children. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.

11. Kraushaar, O.F. American Nonpublic Schools. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.

12. Martin, E.W. "A national commitment to the rights of the individual--1776 to 1976; Exceptional Children, 1976, 43,132-35.

13. _____ Educating Handicapped Children: The legal mandates. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1979.

14. Sarason, S.B., and Doris, J. Educational handicap, public policy, and social history. New York: Free Press, 1979.

15. Townsend, C., and Mattson, R. "The interaction of law and special education: Observing the emperor's new clothes," Analyses and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities, 1981, 1, 75-90.

16. Turnbull, H. and Turnbull, A.P. Free Appropriate Public Education: Law and Implementation. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing Company, 1978.

17. U.S. President. Proclamation. "Education of Handicapped Children: Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act." Federal Register 42, no. 163, 23 August 1977, 42474-42518.

18. Weintraub, F.J., Abeson, A.R., and Braddock, D.L. State Law and Education of Handicapped Children: Issues and Recommendations. Arlington, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1972.